

**Shri Raghavendra His
life and works**

Vol VII

BRAHMA SUTRAS

With

The Commentary of

SHRI MADHVA

And Five glosses of

SHRI RAGHAVENDRA

Part II

BY :

G. B. JOSHI

M.A.B.F.

MARCH 1978

SHRI PACHAVENKARA HIS LIFE AND WORKS

VOL. VII



Published by the author
1978 1st edition
1000 Copies

Storage

BL
1205
R241
1977
V.2.

(All rights reserved by the author)

Price : Rs 7-00

copies available with

G. B. JOSHI

Extension

GADAG (Karnataka)

Printed at :

New Gadag printery, Gadag.

To

The memory of my long departed

Father,

The Late Shri BHIMACHARYA JOSHI

Shri Raghavendra His Life and works

Vol VII

Brahma Sutras with the commentary of Sri Madhva And the five glosas of Raghavendra

Part II

CONTENTS

1)	[I-1-7]	Antasthatvadhikaranam (Bhashya)	1
a)	[I-1-20]	Antastha ddharmopadeshat (Sutra)	2
b)	[I-1-21]	Bhedavyapadeshachanyah (Sutra)	3
1)		Bhavadeepa	3
2)		Nyaya muktavali	9
3)		Tantradeepika	11
4)		Tattvamanjari	12
5)		Prakasha	13
II	[I-1-8]	(Bhashya) Akashadhi Karanam	37
a)	[I-1-2]	Akashastallingat	37
1)		Bhavadeepa	38
2)		Nyayamuktavali	42
3)		Tattvamanjari	43
4)		Tantradeepika	45
5)		Prakasha	46
III	[I-1-9]	Pranadhikaranam (Bhashya)	68
a)	[I-1-23]	Ata evapranah (Sutra)	68
1)		Bhavadeepa	69
2)		Nyaya Muktavali	72
3)		Prakasha	74
IV	[I-1-10]	Jyotiradhikaranam (Bhashya)	88
a)	[I-1-24]	Jyotisharanabhidhanat (Sutra)	88
1)		Bhavadeepa	89
2)		Nyayamuktavali	91
3)		Tattvamanjari	93

4)	Prakashha	94
V [I-1-11]	Chanodobhidhanadhiaranam (Bhashya)	109
a) [I-1-25]	Chandobhidhanannetichenna (Sutra)	
	Tatha chatorpananigadat Tathahi	
	darshanam	108
b) [I-1-26]	Bhutadipadavya padeshopapatteschaivam	
	(Sutra)	109
	(Bhashya)	110
c) [I-1-27]	Upadeshabhedanneti chennobhayasminna	
	pyavirodhat (Sutra)	111
1)	Bhavadeepa	111
2)	Nyaya muktavali	118
3)	Tantra deepika	120
4)	Tattvamanjari	123
5)	Prakash	125
VI [I-1-12]	Padantya Pranadhikaranam (Bhashya)	143
a) [I-1-28]	Pranastathanugamat (Shutra)	143
b) [I-1-29]	Atmopadeshaditichet Adhyatma	
	sambandha Bhumahya sruin	144
c) [I-1-30]	Shastradristyau upadesho vamadevavat	145
d) [I-1-31]	Jeeva Mukhyaprana lingat Netichenna	
	upasa Traividhyat Ashritatvadi	
	hatadyogat	146
1)	Bhavadeepa	148
2)	Nyayamuktavali	154
3)	Tantradeepika	155
4)	Tattvamanjari	158
5)	Prakashha	160
End of First Pada		
I [I-2-1]	Sarvagatattvadhikarana (Bhashya)	186
a)	Sarvatra Prashidhopadeshat	186
b)	Vivak-hita Gunopapattescha	187
c)	Anupapattestuna Shareerah	188

d)	Karma Kartrivypadeshat	188
e)	Shabdavisheshat	188
f)	स्मृतेरुच	189
g)	अर्भकौकस्त्वात् तद्व्यदेशाच्च नेति चेन्न निचाय्यत्वादेवं व्योमवच्च	189
h)	संभोगप्रप्तिरिति चेन्न वैशेष्यात्	190
1)	Bhavadeepa	191
2)	Tattvamanjari	201
3)	Tantra deepika	205
4)	Nyaya Muktavali	209
5)	Prakasha	211
II	Attaritvadhi Karanam	238
a)	अत्ताचराचरग्रहणात्	238
b)	प्रकरणाच्च	239
1)	Bhavadeepa	239
2)	Tantradeepaika	241
3)	Nyayamuktavali	243
4)	Tattvamanjari	242
5)	Prakasha	244
III	Guhadhikaranam	
a)	गुहां प्रविष्टाव त्मानो हितदर्शनत्	252
b)	विशेषणाच्च	253
1)	Bhavadeepa	255
2)	Tantradeepika	260
3)	Tattvamanjari	261
4)	Nyayamuktavali	262
5)	Prakasha	263

Preface

To the readers we had wished 'Bon voyage' two years before when they started their expedition on the ocean of Brahma Sutras by offering VI volume containing Sutra and Bhāshya and the five glosses of Shri Raghavendra on it. It was part one of this great adventure. Now we offer the readers VII volume (part two) of these five glosses. We had given a wrong assurance that we would be able to finish the present work of five glosses with the VIII volume. Because we had not then realised the vastness of the work before us. We now find to our great amazement that we shall be able to finish it only with the X volume. But we are in no way discouraged. As long as our faith in Shri Krishna is firm we need not be dismayed at all. We have entrusted our boat to a great Sailor who knows his trade perfectly well. We know the ocean is deep and infested with dangerous aquatic animals. Whirlpools make sailing very unsafe. The greatest enemies are the hidden rocks. But the great light houses built on the shore fore warn us of their existence and guide us safely through these rocks. This volume VII is the second Light house we meet on our expedition; We have received so long great encouragement from the readers and we hope that they continue to extend this sympathetic help in greater measure till we are out of the wood.

I was born in the year 1897 and by simple calculation I find that in 1978 I complete my 81st year and that too on 27th march, In commemoration of my 81st birth day I offer this present to the readers expecting blessings of many such happy returns from them to enable me to serve them with this sort of work as I have been doing.

27th March 1978
Monday
Phalguna Vadi Triteeya
of
Pingala Samvatsara

G. B. Joshi
Authhor.

Shri Raghavendra His Life and Works

Vol VII

Brahma Sutras with the commentary of Madhva
and the five glosses of Shri Raghavendra

Part II

अंतस्थत्वाविकरणम्

BHASHYA :

It was said in Anandamayadhi Karana) that Anandamaya was ('अदृश्ये अनात्म्ये') not fully knowable (अदृश्य). This (अदृश्य) again "अंतप्रविष्ट कर्तारमेतं अत इयंद्रमस्मिन्साचरंत न सहैवसंत नभिजानन्तिदेवाः" (Gods do not know him, who is settled in the cavity of the heart of man, who is the creator of the world, who wanders freely on the moon and who is always with us associated with some one who is settled inside (अंतस्थ) (इंद्रोराजा... गच्छयुञ्जति) rules over the world he is called the King.....He joins the seven intellect and senses to the objects)and he is known to be some one different from Vishnu. Thus because अंतस्थ is some one different from Vishnu so it should not be considered that the unknowable (अदृश्य) alone is Anandamaya.

To this (the Sidhanti replies)

अंतस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात्—२०

SUTRA :

The one that is heard to be inside is Vishnu alone. The one that is heard to be inside (is Vishnu) for his properties are being narrated ‘one wandering inside the ocean freely; and has established the subjects of each sense-the Brahma (the four faced) realised.’ “Men of wisdom know Vishnu in the (milky) ocean. The Brahmas (of past and future) pray to Vishnu the abode of Mareechies, (for the sake of knowledge). Brahmanda is said to be the semen of Vishnu. These and others are the properties of Vishnu. For he sleeps on the ocean. The Brahmanda is the semen of Vishnu “He deeply contemplating and desirous of creating his manifold progeny, created water first and he ejected his semen in that. It became golden egg refulgent with the lustre of thousand sons. The four faced Brahma the grand father of the world was born in that world (of Vishnu) the waters are associated with Nara (नराः) for they are the children of Nara. Formerly they were his abode. Hence he is called Narayana.” thus is stated in Vyasa smriti.

“Formerly there was the self called Naryana which was unblamable, lustrous, the actuator of souls. Then came out chetana prakriti the group of souls, and the egg (with Brahma, Vayu and Rudra)” so is stated in Chaturveda Shikha.

भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः

SUTRA :

(Not only the one inside is Vishnu; but he is one differnt from Indra and others also. Because the distinguishing properties (of Vishnu) are heard. “For he is the in dweller of Indra;” “the learned saw him the indweller of Vayu.” “He was freely wandering on the Sun”;

“The four faced Brahma saw Vishnu seated in the hearts of gods” these and others are some of the distinguishing qualities (of Hari).

BHAVADEEPA :

Raghavendra first establishes the thought-tink of this Adhikarna with that of Pada, Adhyaya, and shastra. Samanvaya of words like Indra which connote others than Vishnu, in Paramatman is established in this Adhikarna. ‘Samanvaya’ includes this in the Adhyaya ‘in Parmatman’ in this Shastra ‘of words like Indra connoting others’ in the Pada.

अदृश्य in the Shruti means ‘not knowable’ (not wholly knowable) and not ‘imperceptible’. For अनिरूप्येः which

means indescribable is the cause of its unknowability. and it cannot be the cause of imperceptibility.

Thus this Adhikarna is an objection raised on the previous Adhikarna. And this Vedic statement cited is an objection raised against the previous one.

Now आनंदमय is said to be अदृश्य and अनात्मय and this अदृश्य again is said to be some अंतःप्रविष्ट. Now who this अंतः प्रविष्ट is should be decided. This अंतस्थ is again said to be Indra or some body else; and not. Vishnu Hence आनंदमय who is said to be अदृश्य is some one other than Vishnu and hence also the one to be enquired (जिज्ञास्य) is not Vishnu but some one else.

Of course this conclusion is arrived at when one does not make a distinction that Shruti by its inherent nature is stronger than mere Linga as an indicator of purport. And Linga having no scope of other interpretation is stronger than mere Shruti. Or the Purva Paksha is based on the decision of the relative strength of these marks of interpretation. The mark of the sun is stronger than the mark of Vishnu. On the strength of other Vedic Statements mere Lingas of Vishnu are overridden by Linga aided by shruti in the case of the sun and others. This is made clear in Nyaya vivarana.

Shruti regarding Indra by its native merit and by virtue of repetition, and the Linga indicating Surya favoured by Savitru Shruti are powerful. You need not object that Brahma Shruti must indicate Vishnu. For clearly in ब्रह्मतावसान्विदित, Brahma supplies the subject needed by

the verb (अन्वदिदत्) and Brahma is in the Nomenative case. Hence Brahma means four faced Brahma and not Vishnu.

Any how it is not possible for Purva Pakshies to decide the relative superiority of Instruments that decide in favour of Indra and others. So it cannot be stressed that he is Indra alone (and none else) yet it can be decisively proved that here one other than Vishnu and never Vishnu is meant.

Shidhanti boldly contradicts-it. In तत्समन्वयात् the word तत् is there referring to Vishnu. This तत् is imported to every Adhikarana and hence this अदृश्य is अन्तस्थ and he is Vishnu only (तत् OR तदेव) Raghavendra gives us hints to interpret Shruti. when shruti is equivocal, unambiguous Linga which cannot be dispensed with otherwise (अनन्यथा सिद्ध) should decide the case.

भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः ॥

As the marks of interpretation on both sides are equally strong it is very difficult to decide who is अन्तस्थ. Therefore the best way to reconcile these two conflicting sides is to accept identity of both Indra and Vishnu.

Still Vishnu cannot be denied the attribute of अन्तस्थत्व. But this contention is not fair. For as propounded in Sudha the attributes of the unconditioned are agreeably found in the conditioned and hence Indra and others are अन्तस्थ and not Vishnu.

To this Sidhanti rejoins that Vishnu is not only अन्तस्थ but he is also different from Indra and others

As told before here, in every Adhikarana तत् is to be imported from Samanvaya Sutra. This means Vishnu alone is अन्तर्ह्य and this agrees with the statement in Bhashya. This results in part that by the process of Mahayoga and Vidvad Rudhi Tat (तत्) means primarily Hari. This is the main object of our treatise. Otherwise according to the rule stated in कल्पनोपदेशात् if primary connotation is accepted in respect of other referents also, then the statements in every Adhikarna like what is stated is only Hari, would be preposterous.

An objection is raised that Vishnu is not the only chief primary meaning, by the process of Mahayoga and Vidvad Rudhi of all the words in the special Vedic statements cited here. But Vishnu is said to be the only meaning in order to avoid the alternative meaning to Vishnu in the special citation from Veda. But this is not reasonable; because in the special Vedic citation by the law of extension all words referring to gods are shown to mean primarily Vishnu. This extension is exclusively with reference to Vishnu. Because the cause of application that is inherent in the word (प्रवृत्तिनिमित्त) is amply fulfilled in Vishnu by the chief primary connotation while it is poorly fulfilled in other things and hence they are nominally called by those words.

Rudhi or convention is of two kinds. One is the convention of the learned and another is that of the ignorant layman. And even derivation of the wise (Mahayoga) is of two kinds. This cause of application of the word abundantly fulfilled is one. And other is mastery

over the cause of application of others. This is called freedom on account of the unrestricted control over the cause of application.

By the very rule of the chief and Secondary, the chief is recognised and the words Brahma, Rudra and Indra do primarily connote Vishnu. Then where was the necessity of showing the attribute and prove that every word primarily means Vishnu? We do accept this charge. We only contend that the process through the knowledge of attributes is accepted in order to make clear the meaning of the word. That words have no chief connotational reference to any but Vishnu is shown in नेतरोनूपत्तेः though a word has inherent power of reference to Vishnu and others, the chief connotational reference is warranted by marks of interpretation like Abhyasa and others.

In order to prove the universal applicability of the Sutra, the discussion is rounded up with the declaration of the result. It is stated in Nyaya Vivarana that words of material significance and those having the meaning of the spirit are treated in the coming Adhikaranas and they are shown to apply to Vishnu in the highest sense. Similarly words signifying other gods apply to Vishnu following the inherent power of connotation of those words. This is stated in the third Adhyaya of Anubhashya.

Here application of words to Vishnu is shown through specific attributes (लिङ्ग) to facilitate the application of many names to Vishnu. Raghavendra explains what Linga means here. It is the import of a sentence containing

अन्तः or अन्तःप्रविष्ट in such sentences as अन्तःप्रविष्ट and अन्तः चन्द्रमसि.

The all pervasive Hari cannot be contained in limited space-this objection is explained away in सर्वत्रप्रसिद्धोपदेशात्. Hence the immanence of Hari in small things (अन्तःप्रविष्टत्व) is shown reasonable. It cannot be otherwise because it leads to absurdity like this. If अन्तस्थ is not Hari then अदृश्यत्व also which is attributed to अन्तस्थ will be found with some body else. And then आनन्दमय which is found with अदृश्यत्व will be something other than Vishnu)

But भेद or difference between gods and अन्तर्यामि is not nonexistent. For this difference is clearly shown between agent (कर्ता) and object कर्म in a sentence. In this very context it is stated (आत्माजनानाम्) that आत्मा is the immanent and not the original and essential form. According to the direction already shown words like Indra and others chiefly connote Vishnu. But where there is contradiction of this primary sense these words may refer to the respective gods. Thus in इंद्रास्यात्मा and other vedic statements Indra and others may mean popularly known Indra and others. Therefore also the difference is not nonexistent.

Here some body objects that the shruti quoted 'अन्तः प्रविष्ट' does not show अन्तस्थत्व primarily and therefore it is not a good instance. Besides the two sutras one proving अन्तस्थत्व and another भेद treat two subjects which are not interdependent, and lead to disunity of composition. That there is unity of composition in the two sutras is shown by the use of च in the second Sutra and this will have no propriety of use.

This objection is refuted by the statement that the vedic hymn is taken from सुवर्ण चर्म नृवाक and not from 'य एषोतरादित्य' of छांदोग्य as the objector has cited. There अंतस्थत्व is not subordinately stated. And hence both the sutras treat subjects which naturally develop into a unity. The propriety of the use of च is justified by construing both the sutras as 'not only Vishnu is अंतस्थ but he is also different. Only the cause of development is different.

NAYAA MUKTAVALI :

Raghavendra in Nyaya Muktavali offers a gist of logical arguments of these two sutras, in a closely knit dialectical statement, following the the four steps of presentation, along with the thought link from the previous Adhikarana.

Anandamaya is associated with अदृश्य which is found connected with some अंतस्थ. This अंतस्थ is not Vishnu and hence Anandamaya also is not Vishnu. Thus this Adhikarana provides an objection raised against the previous Adhikarana.

In Taittareaya अदृश्य is heard with अंतस्थ. Now a doubt arises whether this अंतस्थ is Vishnu or some Indra or other god. The opposer's view is that अंतस्थ is Indra according to इंद्रोराजा and other shruties. In सप्तयुंजति we find the sun is referred to; and many other shruties show that अंतस्थ is Varuna or Twashtri. No doubt अदृश्यत्व or invisibility and

others are the invariable marks of Vishnu, heard with अंतस्थ. yet the names of Indra and his marks warranted by shruti and convention set aside the marks of Vishnu.

No doubt the marks of Vishnu are many yet shruti has native superiority of connotation and denotes Indra. Again if the marks of Vishnu are also endowed with Superiority of connotation, then let both the evidences warrant both Vishnu and Indra and others as अंतस्थ. So the only way that these two contradictory statements, to remain valid, is to imply that Vishnu and other gods are indetical. Even then the marks of Vishnu refer to unconditioned original form of Vishnu while Indra and others are conditioned forms and thus unreally different Indra and others are अंतस्थ;

Refuting this objection side the shidhanta argues that अंतस्थ is said to reside in the ocean and to be the seed growing into Brahmanda, in the shruti अंतः सद्गुप्तेनसाचरंत. These are the sure marks of Brahma which according to shruties quoted in Bhashya have no other reference but Vishnu. Again shruties like इंद्रस्यात्म and others in this very context clearly prove that अंतस्थ or आत्मा is different from Indra. So identity between Indra and अंतस्थ is not tenable. Besides Indra and such other

words are applicable to Vishnu, the cause of applicability namely wealth being found in unlimited quantity in Vishnu alone; and the wealth of others being under his control. The marks of other gods also by the mode of high derivation, by the authority of veda and by the convention of the wise, according to the rule of shastradrishtya may be found in Vishnu also. Hence अंतस्थ is Vishnu. As regards the result of objection and reply they are stated as before.

TANTRA DEEPIKA :

Raghavendra in Tantradeepika explains sutra on the basis of its construction. In this Adhikarana all words which are the names of gods are shown applicable to Vishnu through the mark of अंतस्थत्व. Supply तत् to complete the sentence. At the end श्रुतम् should be read. In Taittareaya there is heard 'अतः' this अतः श्रुतम् तत्, is Brahma only; and not Indra and others. For residing in the ocean and being the seed of Brahmanda, the attributes of Brahma are heard in shruti अतः. Here sutra really ends with उपदेशात्. But तत् is taken up to show the invariability of the attributes of Brahma. We must construe it thus अतः तत्. But on the strength of shruti and Linga, in the shruti devoted to Indra, अंतस्थ having the

marks of Indra, is also Indra and is identical with Brahman who is अंतस्थ.

Therefore it is said भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः, च conjoins the previous argument with this argument. Here also तद् or that is understood. As it is relevant to read इंद्रादिभ्यः with भेदव्यपदेशात्, इंद्रादिभ्यः should be construed with it. So the whole shruti means that Vishnu, the meaning of तद् or that, is said to be not only अंतस्थ in shruti; But he is also different from Indra and others. The reason is that Vishnu is said to be immanent in Indra and others in shruties like इंद्रस्यात्मा, वायोरात्मानम् and others. But as a coordinate of तद् it should be अन्यद् and नोत अन्यः as used in the sutra. This use of masculine is justified on the ground that आत्मा is used in the shruti and आत्मा is masculine.

TATTVA MANJARI :

Raghavandra presents the cogency of argument involved in the sutra. Vishnu is said to be Purnananda who is said to be अदृश्य. This अदृश्यत्व or invisibility is said to belong to some अंतस्थ. (inmate) who on his part is finally declared to be Indra in unambiguous terms. This long soritee conclusively proves going in the reverse order that Indra is Antastha and hence he is Adhrishya. Being Adhrishya he is Anandamaya. So Indra is Ana-

ndamaya and Vishnu is not. This is the argument of the opposer or purvapakshi.

Hence the sutra proves that Vishnu alone is Antastha. In Anubhasbya the gist of argument involved in this Adhikarana is summed up by the word अंतरः which means अंतस्थ; and is derived from the root अतसात्तस्यगमने along with the preposition अंतः as prefix and the termination उ as the suffix and it means 'Indweller' or inmate or as in अन्योत्तर आत्मा, अंतर means अंतस्थ. This Inmate in ईश, चंद्र and इंद्र is Vishnu alone and none else. From this it is concluded that all words referring to gods like Indra and others that are famous names of other than Vishnu by convention in secular parlance connote Vishnu alone. As Vishnu is immanent in these gods, Vishnu is connoted by their names.

Why should this arbitrary reference to Vishnu be accepted? Because the inherent qualities (सर्वगुणत्वतः) like 'in dweller of the ocean' or 'the primordial seed of Brahmanda' in those words have unequivocal reference to Vishnu. The universality of their meanings is not compatible with the limited nature of these gods. Hence अंतस्थ is Vishnu.

But Indra and other words have exclusive reference to Indra and other gods in Indra

hymns; while Vishnu also is exclusively referred to in other shruties. Thus the only way open to reconciliation of these contradictory statements of shruti is to conceive identity of Indra and other gods with Vishnu.

This is a hopeless mess of confusion in reasoning. Because Vishnu is indweller of these gods being distinctly different from them and not identical with them. (सर्वगुणत्वतः) For all of them are गुण subordinate to Vishnu and He is the undisputed monarch of all. To give this meaning एव should be construed with अंतर which means मित्र or different as cited in Amara (अंतर.....भेदसादश्ये) No doubt अंतर is neuter in this meaning yet it is used here in masculine on the strength of shruties like 'य आत्मनोतरः'. Hence instead of अंतस्थ the word अंतर is used to include the meaning of भेद which is referred to in भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः.

No doubt Indra and other words primarily denote by convention and connote by derivation Indra and other gods; yet the cause of application of those words finds full satisfaction only with reference to Vishnu, as Vishnu possesses those qualities in unlimited quantity. This fact enforces the subordination of Indra and others to Vishnu.

If Indra and other words mean Indra and other gods primarily, they mean Vishnu in the highest primary sense of the learned. This convention of the learned (विद्वद्बुद्धि) entirely depends upon derivation as stated in Veda.

A doubt again is raised. How can Vishnu the all pervasive be contained in small things like Indra and others ? This is a physical truth that a big thing cannot be contained in a small thing. But even physically the big Akasha is found contained in small things like pot, house and others. So Vishnu, yet more truly is found dwelling in small things as he is not physical but subtle. The all pervasive can be in small things but the converse is not true as the small thing cannot be found in all pervasive things.

PRAKASHA :

At the beginning of Anandamayadhikarna, the Purvaparkshin contends that as अंतस्थ is not Vishnu, Anandamaya also is not Vishnu. Ragha-vendra in his prakasha raises an objection to the argument of the purvapakshin. It is not reason able to argue that Anandamaya is not Vishnu because अंतस्थ is not Vishnu. There is clear reason to disprove that अंतस्थ is Vishnu; because there is special reason in the form of Indra hymn and

the invariable marks. But in the case of Anandamaya there is no such special reason to disprove Anandamaya being Vishnu. Hence Anandamaya is Vishnu according to the reasoning adduced by the sidhanti. And अदृश्यत्व cannot be put forth as a spacial reason for Anandamaya being some one different from Vishnu. For अदृश्यत्व agrees with being Vishnu or being non-Vishnu. Besides relying only on the mark or Linga we cannot confute the statement of being Vishnu that is based on Linga and Shruti. On the contrary on the strength of अदृश्यत्व which is known as the mark of Vishnu अंतस्थ itself shall have to be Vishnu.

You should not argue that when अंतस्थत्व is known to belong to Indra, अंतस्थत्व in the form of गुहानिहितत्व (Placed in the cavity) is eulogised to belong to आनंदमय in the sutra सांख्यिक मेवचर्गीयते, and there आनंदमय also is other (than Vishnu) according to the rule to be quoted. For he also is liable to be affected with the same defects.

All this argument becomes null and void when we know that अदृश्यत्व is not mere invisibility but it is positive and unparalleled or unequalled abundance or richness which cannot be shared by a second. Hence this अदृश्य is single and unri-

valled. Hence opposition side argues that this distinguished owner of riches is known to be other than Vishnu; because *इन्द्रश्रुति* by convention is known to belong to the other who is known to be *अंतरस्य* and its mark characterises *अनन्दमय* and hence he is also other. The word Brahma and others are some how to be made to refer to Indra and others. Therefore the rule of non difference between part and whole need not be forced into service here.

This cannot be argued otherwise. For the Shruti and Linga which favour Indra are conventionally fixed in others, have no access to Vishnu; and mere Linga cannot contradict a host of nonapplicable (else where) evidences.

Besides Indra and others being identical with Vishnu, those that connote Vishnu cannot be found in conditioned Indra and those that connote Indra cannot be found in unconditioned Vishnu, we shall have to take recourse to imaginary and unreal difference. Then if *अंतरस्य* is other than Vishnu Anandamaya also is different from Vishnu. Such an objection can be raised. Hence the aforesaid Bheda Vyapadesha also is strongly objected to.

objection-raising, connective link with the previous thought is to be justified. The whole discussion at last melts down to whether the mark

of 'sleeping in the ocean' should be induced to follow Indra shruti or the converse of it would follow. Then arises the question whether Shruti is Niravakasha and Linga or Mark is savakasha or other wise. Again in the case when Linga is Niravakasha, whether decisive superiority belongs to the element of Niravakashatwa (Non-applicability to others) or to the inborn merit of Shruti. The decision of these will lead to settle whether Antastha is Vishnu or Indra and others. If of the two suppositions one is to be led according to the requirements of others then there is फलकलिभावः, the two form one idea, one being the result of the other. Other wise the two suppositions stand side by side being joined together by the copulative conjunction (च) or and.

After showing the sangati the Purvapaksha is taken up for review. The Purvapaksha based on the principle of identity is presented. Antastha is Indra, Agni, Brahaspati, surya and Varuna. For shruti propounds to that effect. The mark or Linga is powerless before Shruti. Hence on the strength of Shruti a decision is taken. But Shruti is equally strong with Brahaspati and all. Hence one like Indra cannot be settled as superior to all.

Suppose we take recourse to derivation and settle that Brahaspati by derivation refers to Indra, then in the same way by derivation Indra Shruti can be interpreted to apply to Brahaspati. It cannot even be settled that Antastha is other than Vishnu. For one inside the ocean (समुद्रोत्स्थ) is a clear mark of Vishnu and hence he cannot be other than Vishnu.

Hence every thing is hanging doubtful and nothing is settled exactly. Under these circumstances One Purvapaksha argues that Indra is repeatedly mentioned in different shruties; hence the marks of Varuna and Shruti of Brahaspati are contradicted.

But repetition of Indra cannot settle the point at issue. For equally well there are repetitions in the case of savitri and Agni. But some nice distinction is made between these two sets of repetitions. Indra is repeated more times than Savitri and others. One should not dare contradict 'many' to spare a few. Besides in the previous Adhikarna Indra is accepted as the controller of Savitri. Here also Indra being superior in rank to Savitri, may be accepted as controller of Savitri; and hence the word सवि॑तृ may be accepted to mean Indra. Hence Indra exclusively may be accepted as Antastha.

Now as an alternative the Purvapaksha based on identity is presented. First this opposition based on identity, is objected. Accepting difference it is possible to argue reference to both Vishnu and others and that too rightly, hence there is no necessity of embracing identity. But is reference to both based on Primary connotation or Secondary or both ? Primary connotation leading to reference to both, causes a split and disunity in a sentence. It is not subordinate connotation; for in some places primary Connotation shall have to be accepted. In the third alternative where both modes are accepted, is it primary in the case of Vishnu and secondary or subordinate in the case of others or vice versa ? The first alternative is not acceptable. Because in the case of others like Indra, convention is accepted. The second alternative necessitates the acceptance of Adwaita or identity. For though there is reference to conditioned Indra and others by primary mode still by secondary or subordinate mode unconditioned Vishnu is referred to. Other wise there will be no unity in the Shastras. For Indra and others to be indential with Vishnu evidence of presumption is cited. And evidence of Shruti also might be cited.

The purvapakshee sums up his argument that Indra and others only are Anandamaya. Therefore it cannot be maintained that they are different from Anandamaya.

But some hold that when Vishnu is determined to be Anandamaya by six evidences you cannot determine him to be other by a mark of the other. By the maxim that a small thing is to be sacrificed to save a great thing, this mark or Linga can very well be set at naught to hold up the truth warranted by a multitude of evidences. Even the argument that one exclusively applicable evidence claiming supernormal strength takes away the wind from the sail of multitudinous evidences, is of no avail. For shruti and others also claim the same type of exclusive applicability and supernormal strength.

At last the opposer is satisfied that there is doubt as to who Anandamaya is and taking benefit of this doubt he jumps to the conclusion that Vishnu cannot be the only Anandamaya. Hence Indra and others can be अतस्थ and अदृश्य

Now begins the argument of Sidhanti. First a general rule is quoted in which the relative strength of Shruti and Linga is determined. Shruti is naturally stronger than Linga. Yet

Linga of exclusive application is stronger than Shruti having applicability else where.

Yet in श्येनेन अभिचरन्त्यजेत् what is Shyena is the point at issue. The word श्येन by convention means 'hawk'. still it is quoted यथावं श्येनो निपत्य आदत्ते as an instance of Similarity. It is a truism to say a thing is similar to itself. So in order to avoid self comparison, and contextual contradiction with the remaining part of a sentence, it must also maintain the respectable dignity of a special injunction. Therefore shyena should mean a Sacrifice of that name. In the same manner even though Shruti is naturally powerful when referring to Indra, Linga favoured by the remaining part has strength of being unutilised elsewhere, contradicts Shruti as an exception and it is not to its discredit. Now also the same line of interpretation should be adopted here.

But this illustration does not suit the context. For as in the illustration in the present topic the distinguishing mark is not characterised by exclusive applicability (निरवकाशः). To this the rejoinder is that residence in the ocean is exclusively applicable to Vishnu and to none else.

But this line of argument pleads at Ithndra Shruti इंद्रमित्रं वरुणमग्निमाहुः shows that the word Indra

refers to Vishnu through the primary mode on the strength of the convention of the wise. Really speaking wealth, the cause of applicability of the word Indra is owned independently and to the highest extent only by Vishnu. And hence through the mode of highest derivation also Vishnu is referred to. It should not be doubted that there is identity between Indra and Vishnu. Because Vishnu is said to be *गोदेवानां देवतमः* the greatest among gods. Again the names of Vishnu cannot refer to Indra and other gods.

Then a doubt arises: If Indra shruties primarily refer to Vishnu through the high mode of derivation and the convention of the wise and when primary and secondary meanings are available, the primary to be preferred to secondary. Thus Vishnu is proved to be the primary import of Indra Struties, and there was no necessity of mentioning the mark of exclusive applicability in the Sutra. In justifying this mention of the unique mark we admit its redundancy; for it is done so in Nyayavivarana elucidation. Or to show that there is no exceptional reason to set aside the usual acceptance of primary meaning This operation of high derivation and wise convention begins from *तत्तु समन्वयात्* and is continued uptil

now and तत् is construed with अंतस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात्. तु is used in the sense of 'exclusiveness' and inwardness is said to belong to exclusively Vishnu. In other references there is only the operation of low type of derivation and ignorant convention. This implies that the operation of the highest modes of interpretation is active only in respect of Vishnu.

Thus the first Sutra in the Adhikarana proves that अंतस्य is Vishnu only by its exclusive marks; and disproves the contention of the first Purvapaksha. The second Purvapaksha will be scrutinised in due course; but before that the third Purvapaksha of identity is refuted by showing the contradiction mentioned in the second sutra of the Adhikarana. Now the question is whether identity is accepted by the opposer, as Shruti and Linga with equal force of application set forth both Vishnu and the other with no way left for decisive determination, Or to reconcile statements from other shastras.

Now the first alternative is taken for critical review. If in order to maintain the propriety of both Shruti and Linga in all their glory of force of application to both Vishnu and others, identity of Vishnu and Indra is accepted, then in the coming Akashadhikarana there is a Shruti आकाशादेव संप्रत्यक्षे in which आकाश is supposed to be

elemental Akasha. But on account of the Linga the cause of all beings it is decided to be the supreme Brahma. This should not be. For here also to maintain the force of both Shruti and Linga, the identity of both elemental Akasha and Para Brahma should have been pleaded. Here causality is said to be as accepted by others. Another instance from Meemansa is cited where also this reduction to absurdity is shown.

There is a rule in Meemansa that if many are meant for the same purpose, and if they are to aid the same thing and if they are prescribed independent of each other, then there is option between them. But in Jyotistioma 'ऐन्द्रागार्हपत्यं उपतिष्ठते' one should worship Garhapatya by reciting Shruti devoted to Indra. There as the context is the contact of gods and Substances having the same purpose of winning अदृष्ट (merit conducive to swarga) they are to be taken simultaneously and the repetition is justified. But in 'ब्रीहिभिः यज्ञेऽयवैः यज्ञे' we find two sentences.

They are independent of each other (ब्रीहि and यव); and they are prescribed to be the materials to prepare Purodasha. Their disposal, therefore is accepted successively and not simultaneously. Then the main is not to be repeated. Even blend-

ing of the two is not reasonable as they are prescribed independent of each other. This necessarily leads to option

Raghavendra gives the implication of this illustration. As either of Shruti and Ling stands uncontradicted in order to accept both, if identity (between Indra and Vishnu) is taken recourse to then Akasha and Brahma (In आकाशस्तेल्लिगात्) would be identical dispensing with their distinguishing characteristics of आकाशत्व and ब्रह्मत्व and Mantra affording the Linga for Indra and Brahman affording Shruti for Garhapatya prove identity of both Indra and Garhapatya by the omission of इन्द्रत्व and गार्हपत्यत्व. You need not seek contradiction of Shruti by Linga or of Ling by Shruti. Thus in order to reconcile two contradictory Statements, if this rule of identity is accepted then in the context of accepting Vrihi and rejecting Yava, you shall have to accept identity of Vrihi and Yava rejecting Vrihitva and Yavatva; and not the Meemansa way accepting Vrihi to the rejection of Yava or accepting Yava to the rejection of Vrihi. This sort of interpretation will lead to the futility of the science of interpretation (Meemansa Shustra)

Thus as identity cannot be acceptable the only way left to keep the integral unity of the Shastras, when we cannot decide the relative strength of

Indra and other gods is to accept that all words connote Vishnu by the highest derivation and the convention of the wise. This only keeps the unity of the topic in tact.

But if Hari is the chief connotation of words like Indra and others, then take the Shruti 'इन्द्रस्यात्मा निहितः पंचहोता'. If Indra in this Shruti means Vishnu you cannot prove Vishnu to be different from Indra on the ground that he is stated to be the immament Lord of Indra.

To this objection the reiinder is that there is an amendment to the universal meaning of Vishnu. Where there is contradiction Indra and other words mean the respective deities in the lower connotation. Here the immanent (आत्मा) is different from Indra. Hence it is the minor god Indra and not Vishnu

Then what about the exclusive marks of Surya and Varuna like one wheel and others ? They also should be attributed to the immanent Vishnu on the same lines as dictated in the Pranadhikarana at the end of this pada.

Here another objection is raised. Just as in अव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः, अव्यक्त cannot mean Vishnu. For the Ablative case clearly shows lower state in Avyakta than Para purusha. This contraicdts

the supremacy in Hari. Still Avyakta is Hari because अवस्त्व in Avyakta refers to अवस्त्व in Vishnu not as his inherent quality but as the one over which he has control. He is freely the cause of अवस्त्व in others. Hence the first word in the ablative case अव्यक्तात् is really Vishnu. So also here there is Subordinateness in others. But the dispenser of this subordinateness is Vishnu. Hence here also in इंद्रस्यात्मा Indra being the controller of the inferiority in others means Vishnu. Hence the word need not renounce its chief meaning. Thus in one context there will be no other meaning.

This is seriously objected and keenly refuted. For if अव्यक्तात् Avyakta means something other than Brahma (Vishnu), then in following 'अनाद्यानतं महतः परं ध्रुवं' also there would be no reference to Vishnu. Because there is the sure mark of 'Greater than Mahat' if Brahma is not referred to here it will not be proper. For there is reference to him who is the cause of Mukti. Therefore somehow contradiction may be set aside and (अव्यक्तात्) Avyakta might mean Brahma. But here in इंद्रस्यात्मा if Indra were to mean something other than Brahma there is no contradiction. For from the statement इंद्रो राजा we get the cause of the application (the attribute of wealth) by applying Indra to Vishnu

For this higher application (समन्वाय) of Indra to Vishnu alone will refute the objection based on अदृश्यत्व by the Purva pakshee.

But in this manner if we proceed in अनेन जीवेन आत्मना the word जीव by its application to Vishnu gets its attribute established as the cause of application, which will not be useful in the Samanvaya of जीव in Vishnu in such statements as जीवाएवतु दुःखिनः.

Such an objection is not sound for there is special statement that Vishnu is called बद्ध (bound) because he is the cause of बंधन and he is दुःखी because he is the cause of दुःख. Such special statements facilitate the Samanvaya of जीव in Hari. But in the case of इंद्रस्यात्मा there is no such special statement. Hence there is (बाध) or contradiction of the Samanvaya of इंद्र in Hari; and so इंद्र means some one other than Hari.

Or if you so insist there in इंद्रस्यात्मा also we admit the Samanvaya of इंद्र in Vishnu in order to prove the applicability of all words (सर्वशब्दसमन्वय) to Vishnu in the highest connotation. Hence Chandrikakar says that the word इंद्र has अन्यपरता reference to the other and he has not said अन्यमात्र परता reference only to the other.

Thus Chandrikakar having explained his stand with reference to the interpretation of the Adhi-

karana and the Sūtras in its setting, now shows how the interpretation of other is not faithful to the original setting of Adhikarana and Sūtras.

The others quote Chandagya first Adhyaya य एषोतरादित्ये — — य एषोतराक्षिणिपुरुषोदृश्यते. The question is who is this Purusha in the orb of the sun. The objection side considers him to be a transmigratory soul who has earned great wealth through knowledge and activity; and not Paramatma. For this indweller is described as having golden moustaches and other attributes which are incongruent with the nature of Paramatman. Then Bhamati is quoted to corroborate this statement.

But this runs counter to another statement regarding the sun. Where he is described as 'immune to sins' and as 'the soul of all'. These do not fit in with others, 'but adjust themselves with Paramatman who is eternally pure, and who being the material cause of all is not different from all. Other gods like the sun are said to be different from all. Hence the indweller is proved to be one different from the transmigratory soul.

Then the question as to the Conformity of colour and form with the nature of Paramatma is explained in two ways. Form and colour in the

formless and colourless Paramatman are assumed at his own will in his characterised nature for the convenience of the aspirant. Or another explanation is that Brahman is the material cause of all and those attributes that characterise the effects are shown as existing in Brahman. The description of an assumed form of Brahma is to lead the aspirant from this assumed form to the formless whose knowledge is essential for Moksha. This is the interpretation of the followers of Shankara.

Now Ramanuja also is taken up for review. His objection and rejoinder also are some what similar. He also takes the same Upanishadic statement and forms the same objection. When the itinerant soul assumes the body for the enjoyment of fruits of its own actions it becomes eligible to be the indweller of the orb of the sun. But the unfailing marks of immunity from sins and lotus eyedness show the indweller to be Paramatma. The colour of the sun and others are in conformity with the immaterial body of the Paramatman. Besides there is the mention of difference of the soul and Paramatman.

These two interpretations, on account of the incompatibility of the quotation are summarily rejected. Our interpretation affords a fine connect-

ing link with the previous thought in the form of an objection raised against Anandamayadhikarana. This objection is raised on the strength of अद्वयत्वगुण and the reason of difference between the two. Now both these interpretations of Adwaitin and Ramanuja cannot establish any such thought link with the previous Adhikarana. This is the common defect of both interpretations. Now the specific defect of each. The Adwaitin attributes form to a formless Brahman for the sake of Upasana. Then he assumes 'immunity to sin' in Jeeva for Upasana. But Advaiti contends that 'sins' in Jeeva has empirical truth and their negation amounts to Pratibhasika Satya or apparent truth. On the other hand formlessness in Brahma will be empirical. Shruti is considered valid treating objects empirically true; but in the case of Jeeva, immunity from sins would be apparent truth and Shruti will be degraded for treating objects of apparent truth.

But this contention of the Adwaitin does not hold good. For even he accepts ब्रह्मत्व in name and others (नामब्रह्मेत्युपासीत) to be of apparent reality. So here also let it be like that. For in his system in such injunctions. (नामब्रह्मेत्युपासीत) the only significant part is कर्तव्यत्व or obligatoriness. They

do not signify the objects at all. And in obligatoriness you cannot make a distinction as empirical or apparent in truth, as in an object. with regard to the attributes of the effect being stated to be in the cause Brahman both being identical, it is not reasonable to do so. For just as gold is called by the name of the ornament and also the ornament is called by the name of gold, so also attributes of Brahma should be stated to be in the effects.

But this sort of blame cannot be charged against Advaitin because he does not accept Brahma as the material cause undergoing modification but he accepts Brahman as locus (अधिष्ठान) of the illusion of the world. Therefore it is proper that the attributes of the Super-imposed are stated to be in the locus and not Vice versa

But if this is so you are only going from the frying pan into fire. For if various attributes of various effects are to be stated in the material cause Brahma, then statements regarding Brahman with various conflicting attributes would never be reconciled.

Again the statement of Brahman with attributes leads to the knowledge of attributeless Brahman is an unfounded truth. Before settling

this question some more clarification is sought; whether mere knowledge of Brahman with attributes leads to the knowledge of attributeless absolute Brahman or it is the constant and continual meditation of these attributes that leads to attributelessness or absoluteness of Brahman.

The very question of attributelessness is critically analysed. Does Dhyana mean meditation of Brahman as having absence of determinants or Dhyana means upasana which is nothing but Super imposition of certain unreal attributes on Brahman as we superimpose silverness on the shell. If the first type is the Nirvisheshita Brahman whose knowledge is necessary for Moksha, it goes against your system. Because in your system विशिष्ट ज्ञान knowledge of attributes does not conduce to Moksha. If Attributeless ness without forming a constituent part of Brahman is an accidental mark (उपलक्षण) of Brahma, then it is of the type of a crow perching on the house. If so the attributelessness also has a position of some kind as that of crow. Now the thing marked by this accident is merely the thing or is it an attribute inherent in Brahman. Brahman does not inhere such a distinction; hence this distinction of attributeless-

ness is again some accident and not an inherent quality; and that is already known. Besides in his system Brahman known as characterised by an accident is not the cause of Moksha.

yet the Advaitin tries to slip through the shidhanti's fingers. For he says that cognition of substantive unadjoined is not obtained before. But this is mere jumble of words without any concrete thought behind it. For the knowledge of amplified substantive does never end in the absence of cognition of amplification.

The whole thing is wound up in verse thus; It is simply contradiction interms to say that knowledge of amplified substantive leads to knowledge of pure substantive bereft of amplification.

We shall close this Adhikarana with a grammatical note on सौहृदात् in a verse as सौगतसौहृदात् (in alliance with Saugata or Baudha). There is a sutra हृद्भगसिध्वते पूर्वपदस्यच (7-3-19) in compounds having हृद्, भग and सिध्व as their last member, the vowels in both first and last members under go Vridhi. सुहृद् is the compound word in which सु and हृद् both under go Vridhi and hence the form is सौहृद् and hence here it must be सौगत सौहृदात् and not, as it is, सौगत सौहृदात्.

To this objection दुर्बटवृत्तिकार replies that an ordinance with संज्ञा is not compulsory. Therefore the Sutra हृद भग सिध्वन्ते does not operate here. So Vowels in both the members do not under go Vridhi. But according to तद्धितेष्व चासादेः before तद्धित terminations having ड or ण् as -इत् only the vowel of the first member under goes Vridhi, thus it is सौहृद.

But here another objection is raised. There is a paribhasha to the effect that अर्थवदग्रहणे नानर्थकस्य which implies that of the two members सु and हृद् the word that has meaning (which is further explained as 'the meaning should rise to be a qualification of the word) should under go vridhi. As an instance स्वरूप is taken and रूप is accepted as having meaning. So also in सु and हृद्, हृद् is a meaningful word and it should under go vridhi and not सु.

This objection is set aside by stating that सुहृद् दुर्हृदोभिन्नामित्रे. सुहृद् jointly means मित्र and not singly. And hence हृदय singly has no meaning and hence both सु and हृद् do not under go Vridhi. Only the first word namely सु under goes Vridhi.

Some others still consider हृद् in हृदभग as a synonym of हृय. But in हृदयस्य हृल्लेख 'यदण्लासेषु' when हृदय has before it लेख, यत्, अण् and लास, in its place comes हृद्

(आदेश). In सौहृदम् हृदादेश. Hence Kalidasa in Kumara Sambhava uses 'क्षणमिन्नसौहृदः' (so also in utara Ramacharita there is सौहृदात् अपृथगाश्रयाभिमां")

आकाशाधिकरणम्

We hear (in Taittareeya) a reason adduced for Akasha to be full of bliss or to be Ananda-maya. "Had not this all shining body been full of bliss (no one else would impel this world to activity) then no one would actuate the world, nor induce it to do meritorious deed".

But this is not mentioned as Vishnu. Thus you should not suppose, that this is not mentioned as Vishnu. For in the Sutra आकाशस्तत्त्वित्वात् it is stated that Akasha is Vishnu only; (And not the commonly known Akasha) For he is stated to possess the marks of Vishnu.

BHASHYA :

"What is the support of this Visible world ? He is all shining Akasha." Thus physical Aksha is referred to. But this does not suit the context. But Vishnu alone is meant. For, further this Akasha is said to be much more superior; and loudly Sung; and he is (not limited by time, space or attributes) unlimited. These and others are his (invariable) marks.

(His unlimited nature is justified thus) who is able to enumerate exhaustively His brave deeds ? who is again able to count the particles of dust ?

(His over-Superiority is proved thus) He grew beyond measure. These and others are his unfailing marks.

It is stated in Brahma- "Vishnu alone is really said to be Ananta or unlimited and is described really by such words as Ananda and other words; while others are thus described only figuratively.

In Bhallaveya it is stated—"All names enter into him.

BHAVADEEPA :

words there are, that are familiarly known to have another meaning. These words of other meanings are of two types. Those that are known so in secular field. Or known in the secular world as coming from Vedic Literature, explicitly or implicitly as marks. The first type are treated in the first pada and the second type are treated in the second pada.

The purvapaksha is to be built. Anandamaya is said to be Akasha which again by Rudhi, a strong mode of connotation, means physical Akasha (one of the five elements). And the mode of derivation or योगवृत्ति may help us to get at the meaning of Vishnu. But when there

is no strong objection against the main sense we should not sacrifice it for our whimsical needs.

But there is one objection against the conventional meaning or Rudha meaning of Akāsha viz physical Akasha. This Akasha is said to be Ananta. But some how Ananta too or unlimited nature too should be made to conform to the conventional meaning of Akasha or physical Akasha. The precedent decision in respect of समुद्रस्थत्व or residence in the ocean does not favour the acceptance of yoga mode in this case as both are not similar. For Residence in the ocean' had been decided by shruti to be the exclusive mark of Vishnu. Shruties referring to Indra and others are coventionally held to mean so by the ignorant, though having no scope to mean any other sense they yield to the mode of derivation or yoga and thus refer to Vishnu.

But here 'unlimited nature' is not yet proved to be the exclusive property possessed by Vishnu. Hence this case does not come under the perview of precedent decision, and is open to consideration. But Sudha accepts the inclusion of this cause also in the preecedent dcision by admitting the claim of unlimited nature to be the exclusive mark of Vishnu. Hence this case needs no further discussion. But it is introduced here only as an additional doubt.

Besides yoga requires the cause of application to be either in itself or under its control when possessed by others. The first alternative is not at all applicable. For hollowness or दिवरत्व is the exclusive property of Akasha and the second alternative also is not possible. Because the insentient Akasha cannot depend upon Vishnu for its natural

characteristic. While the sentient for its activity depends upon Vishnu's grace the Insentient inheres its nature of hollowness and does not depend upon Hari's grace. Besides hollowness does not agree with the nature of Vishnu.

Now the Purvapaksha is wound up thus: Akasha stated in chandogya is physical Akasha. And Akasha in Taittareeya said to be Anandamaya to justify his propelling of the world is also physical Akasha. Unlimited nature also is some how reconciled with physical Akasha. Hence Anandamaya is not Vishnu but Physical or भूताकाश. Anandamaya may not be compatible with the insentient nature of physical Akasha; But Ananda or joy may belong to the presiding deity of Physical Akasha.

when thus the Purvapaksha is stated the sutra begins the refutation, अस्य लोकस्य कायतिः आकाश इति होवाच. Here the word आकाश does not mean physical sky but Vishnu only. For there are Vishnu's clear marks like परोक्षीयत्व. आकाश in chandogya also means Vishnu. Therefore in क्रोहि also आकाश is Vishnu. Now the decisive reason is that in chandogya the exclusive mark pleads for Brahman and the contradiction of the convention of the Ignorant for Akasha to have reference to physical Akasha is common to both. Hence this offers no reason for Akasha to be Anandamaya. The argument runs in a different course. There being exclusive mark of Vishnu in the Akasha of chandogya in क्रोहि also in Taittareeya the same Vishnu is Propounded. The reason is for this same Vishnu to be Anandamaya and not for Akasha to be Anandamaya.

But Shruti and Linga are the means that settle the purport. Purvapakshee built his statement on the strength of Shruti. But refutation was based on Linga or Mark which is naturally accepted to be weaker than Shruti. This defence of Purvapaksha is not sound. Because priority is not the only thing that settles relative strength of these purport-finders. There are other elements also that enter into the settlement of the Purport. For even the less powerful Linga gains in strength over Shruti, when Linga is Nirvakasha and Shruti is savakasha. Even then how is it that Linga refers to Vishnu? आकाश has the nature of space or hollowness, and it gives space to things that exist. This donation of space is under the control of God and hence space, though a natural quality is yet under the control of Hari and hence Akasha means Hari. For Hari's control of Space-giving is unlimited. Hence Shruti says that Hari is endowed with all physical or material qualities also.

तत्तु is imported into every Sutra meaning 'That is Vishnu alone.' Of these two words तु implies that every word even referring to others, by the highest mode of derivation and the convention of the wise refers to only Vishnu.

Here the following reasoning is adduced to prove that Akasha means Vishnu through its cause of application. Spacegiving quality of hollow Akasha is a natural quality no doubt. But that still comes under the perview of Divine control, because, the qualified object Akasha itself is fully under the control of Hari, for its birth, Sustenance and

destruction; and this fact necessitates even its quality to be subordinate to Hari's inexorable will.

In the Sutra the phrase तल्लिगात् 'on account of his mark' implies many such exclusive reasons. The subject आकाशः implies all words referring to physical, spiritual and vedic objects. But in the Sutra only Akasha is mentioned because brevity is the breath of the Sutra. As a representative Akasha which is the first cause of all material objects and which is contextually related to the previous discussion, is mentioned in the Sutra.

आकाशस्तल्लिगात्

NYAYA MUKTAVALI :

The thought link with the previous treatment is either over extension as a new doubt is raised on the previous treatment or a counter-illustration as the Purvapaksha is raised in a different manner from the previous one. In Chandogya in the first Adhyaya it is mentioned "who is the support of this world" Thus asked Shalavatya; and as a reply it is given—"Akash." Now the doubt is whether this Akasha is Physical sky or Vishnu. Now by convention Akasha refers to Physical Akasha and Akasamheans the sky. This does not run counter to the specified marks of Vishnu. For direct reference (shruti) is more powerful than Linga or Mark. But you should not contend that the previous argument that Linga is exclusive and hence it contradicts the conventional meaning holds good here; and hence there is no scope for such a doubt. For the wealth of Indra is obtained by the grace of God and hence is under his control and Indra means Vishnu because the cause of application is

under his control no doubt. But Akasha is insentient and does not seek his Grace. And hence the cause of application of Akasha is hollowness and is not under his control nor does it inhere in him, so it does not mean Vishnu and hence there is scope for this additional doubt. The Linga that has previously led to Shidhanta is not this, this is some thing else. Thus in Bhashya Previously a Shruti had settlead its meaning to be Vishnu; yet it is not yet settled here and by the help of Shruti it conventionally means to refer to physical sky and this is the Purvapaksha.

Now sidhanta is that Akasha is said to be superior to the superior and loudly praised, and is unlimited and a Smriti very well explains parovareeyatva as the better of the best and with the help of many corroborative Shruties which all prove Akasha to refer to Vishnu. On the strength of it, Shruti surrenders its right of upholding the popular meaning and comes to mean Vishnu. Thus आकाश means Vishnu.

It is not that there is no cause of applicability of Akasha to Vishnu. For in smriti is stated that under His guidance this sky gives space to the breathing beings. Again common sense implies that when the sentient is under His control, much more so is the insentient Akasha. Now the rule of semantics allows applicability of word to a thing when that property is found in it or it has control over it. The property of Akasha, Viz hollowness is not to be found in Hari but He has controt over it. Besides Smriti corroborates the fact that Vishnu also has all physical qualities in him; and therefore hollowness is to be found in Him and thus Hari is the main meaning of Akasha.

If this Akasha is not Vishnu then Akasha referred to as Anandamaya also is not Vishnu. To settle this objection and the rejoinder to it, is the main purpose of this discussion.

TATTVAMANJARI :

Still Vishnu or Brahman is not Purnananda. For In that context Some Akasha is called Ananda without any qualification; hence it is Purnananda. यदेष आकाश आनंदो न स्यात्). This Akasha is nothing but physical sky from such shruties as अस्य लोकस्य कागतिः and from the wide currency it has got. This Akasha in the above quotation is introduced as गति to this Earth and as the material cause of vayu and others and hence it must be physical sky. Hence this physical sky is perfectly blissful and that is Anandamaya. So the Sutra says आकाशस्तलिगात् and its meaning as given in Anubhashya is खवत् and अंतरः should be repeated here and it carries the meaning of space or extension, So the whole meaning is "Vishnu is extensive or Spacious like the sky. Just as the sky is extensive or hollow permitting the wanderings of animals, so also Vishnu is extensive or hollow physically permitting animals to wander as described in Sudha. This physical hollowness is the cause of application of Akasha to Vishnu. In the Bhashya on the IX chapter of Geeta it is stated that "you should know God to be endowed with all physical qualities". It only means that God Vishnu is one endowed with unlimited space or hollowness. Hence that chief meaning of Akasha is Vishnu. This implies that all words of physical sense like Akasha mean Vishnu only by the mode of interpretation of convention by the wise and by a high derivative

mode, though in local parlance they refer to other things. The physical sky is not their meaning. Because giving room or space Uests finally with Vishnu primarily. Hence those words also connote Vishnu only. For he alone is endowed with all qualities like supreme sovereignty, unlimitedness, and source of all activity. This is not possible with a physical object.

Just as the cause of application of the word Akasha viz the giving space to others is the impicator for all physical words, and shows that for that reason the word Akasha signifies Vishnu chiefly. So also all physical words are fully significant when applied to Vishnu. For Vishnu has control over the cause of application and he has all those properties in him (सर्वगुणस्वतः).

TANTRADEEPIKA :

In this Adhikarana all words having physical meaning are shown as significantly applying to Vishnu. The word Akasha as implying all those words, being an important one, is mentioned here. तत् is imported here. The word आकाश in chandogya is Hari as a result of high derivation and the convention of the wise and not physical sky by mere convention. For in the Shruti where Akasha is stated, highest supremacy and unlimitedness are mentioned as referring to Akasha. And they are the exclusive marks of Vishnu. विनात् in the Sutra is used in the singular to imply a group.

with every Adhikarana तु is imported meaning exclusiveness, in order to show that Vishnu alone is the chief

meaning of तत् through the mode of the convention of the wise and of high derivation, just as in अभिमानिव्यपदेशस्तु, तु is used to show the presiding deity exclusively. This is not possible when the other meaning is primary or this meaning is secondary. Following the rule of primary and secondary modes those words are said to signify Vishnu. And it is accepted that repetition and the statement of its quality and its mark are meant to show purport only and not to decide the chief meaning.

PRAKASHA :

At the beginning, chandrikakara takes a very critical stand about the thought link of the Adhikarana. And Raghavendra in his Prakasha furnishes a thought-plank. Here in this Adhikarana some natural property of a thing is chosen as the cause of application of that word to Hari. Only such words are chosen for samanvaya in Hari in this Adhikarana. This property might be either physical or non-physical. Hence to limit samanvaya of physical words alone by implication to this Adhikarana is unwarranted.

This doubt raised has been cleared in two ways :—
1) Even words connoting non-material things will get thus samanvaya in Vishnu proved if the objection raised in their respect has also followed the same rule that the nature of insentient or Sentient does not come under the perview of the divine control. For his Adhikarana conclusively proves that even nature of things depends upon the will of Hari. Still only words of material meaning being similar (to Akasha) enter into our mind first. While in the previous Adhikarana words meaning gods like Indra and others and in the future

Adhikarana words of spiritual meaning like Prana and others are dealt with as their samanvaya does not depend upon their nature as the cause of application. Their samanvaya was sought by depending upon the invariable mark of Vishnu. Hence Akasha is said to imply only material words.

Now another doubt arises viz. The same invariable Linga or mark which has captured the mind ought to have been sought for the samanvaya and not the name. But this requires clarification. Do you drive at the fact that samanvaya of the Linga, the general cause of all material things should be sought, or the Linga accepted by the Sidhanti? In the first alternative the case is different from the Previous Adhikarana. For in that Adhikarana by the samanvaya of one Linga called अतस्तत्त्व samanvaya was sought in many names. But here also manytimes. Akasha is repeated and with the same Linga in many (times repeated) names samanvaya is sought. Raghavendra makes the point clear. In the last Adhikarana by the samanvaya of one Linga in Hari many names had their samanvaya in him. But here one name Akasha had its samanvaya in Hari and on the strength of that samanvaya many Links were shown to exist in Hari meaningfully. Here the same Akasha repeated forms a group of Akasha. The word Akasha that forms the group has the same cause of application. But what is wanted is that many names forming a group should have different cause of application.

Still further it is objected that by the samanvaya of one Linga, it is implied that many Lingas and names found their samanvaya in Hari by presumption. Hence here also Linga should be shown to exist in Hari, for the samanvaya of names in Hari.

But the problem of samanvaya may be presented from another point of view. By the samanvaya of one Linga if it is sought in similar and dissimilar cases it is only a round about way, when another way is open to us. Besides names fixed to connote other things will not easily enter into our mind for samanvaya in Hari. And Lingas not fixed to connote other things, do not easily enter into our mind for the sake of samanvaya. Hence the Lingas not fixed else where should be given a chance for samanvaya. But this does not hold water. For such words like Indra have been shown to be easily agreeable to samanvaya so they enter into mind easily.

If the second alternative is accepted, अनन्तत्व is the reason accepted by the sidhanti and there is no scope for doubt. But this statement runs counter to the coming statement that अनन्तत्व is not accepted as a definite and determined mark of Vishnu: though residence in the ocean is found as such a specific mark of Vishnu.

This is not so; for really speaking the doubt raised here is not based on real fact; but it is based on some presumption relying, on आकाशश्रुति. And then Linga is shown to refer to Vishnu. So this Linga is not dependent on Shruti and hence Shruti Samanvaya alone is justified. Hence Nama samanvaya alone is the right one.

In both Bhashya and Teeka it is argued that if आकाश in आकाश इतिहोवाच is physical or material then आकाश also in कोहोवाच्यात्कः प्राण्यात् would be physical. So in order to prove its Vishnutwa आकाश in आकाश इतिहोवाच also has to be Vishnu. Now this argument hence is said to be fruitful.

But it is objected that this sort of argauing is not fruitful; for even if आकाश in chagdogya is Vishnu, Still आकाश in कोहोवान्यात् need not be Vishnu. Therefore this sort of discussion does not bear fruit. So it is objected that just as in Sidhanta आकाश in आकाश इतिहोवाच is Brahmn; yet in आकाशः संभूत it is a physical object, so in Sidhanta there, in यदेष आकाश also let Akash be a physical object.

There is a counter-objection to this. No doubt in the Adhikarana 'कारणत्वेनचाकाशात्' आकाश in a संभूतवाक्य is said to refer to Vishnu. Then how does that refer to a physical object ? The reply is that आकाश means Vishnu not exclusively but inclusive of a physical object Hence it also means a physical object.

But in संभूतवाक्य, आकाश refers to physical sky because there is the indisputable mark of a physical object in it; in कोहोवान्यात् in Akasha there is the invariable mark of Vishnu viz 'prompter of the world.' and hence there is its samanavaya in Brabma. Thus in Sidhanta there is fruitfulness. Then in Purvapaksha there is fruitlessness in the form of objection raised.

It is quoted along with an instance by Chandrikakar. If in यदेष, there is Brahman mark and hence there is reference to Brahman, then just as in Sidhanta in संभूत वाक्य on account of the material mark there is reference to material object for आकाश, So also in यदेष there is Brahman mark and आकाश refers to Brahman. Thus then in the Purvapaksha आकाश no doubt refers to physical sky, But in यदेष there is

Brahma mark and आकाश clearly refers to Brahma. Therefore the objection over Anandamaya Adhikarana does not arise at all.

This is a strong objection against the thought link given by Chandrikakara. Now Chandraikakara refutes this objection. But Raghavendra clarifies the issues involved in the objection so that the refutation becomes significant and meaningful.

Suppose, as in संभूत वाक्य, so also in यदेष there is reference to both material and non-material on the strength of Akasha Shruti and Brahma mark. So संभूत वाक्य has clear reference to Brahma and hence no objection can rise against Anandamaya as a reason is adduced for Anandamaya to be Vishnu. But this objection is not justified. For in संभूतिवाक्य if reference to material cause is not accepted you cannot explain the physical creation. But in यदेष if, there is no reference to material there will be no such absurdity. Hence there is no reference to material. This is in conformity with the exclusive Brahma mark,

But the objection raised against the Sidhanti is baseless. For his argumentation is purposeful; while Purvapaksha also is equally fruitful. Thus goes on the discussion about Sangati or thought link when all objections are taken up for critical scrutiny and their hollowness is exposed. Examining Sangati and Prayojana, now the object of discussion and the form of doubt also are stated.

The topic of discussion is whether आकाश is physical sky or Bhrama ? Here Shruti Statemant taken for discussion

(विषयवाक्य) is from Chandogya. It is an answer for the question of Shalavatya about the support of the earth. The answer is आकाश इति होवाच. This आकाश is said to be सण्णपरोवरीयान्. This आकाश implies all the other four elements (भूत) like wind and others. Now should we depend up on the Shruti and call this आकाश physical sky or depend upon परोवरीयत्व attribute (Superior to the Superior) and call it Brahma? Now Purvapaksha is that आकाश is physical sky and this argument is fruitful. Because if जड or insentient is independent of Brahman, then the cause of application of words to such material objects which are independent of Brahman, is not found in Brahman, and besides Shruti will lose its primary importance if आकाश is applied to Brahman in contradiction of its materiality. Thus पूर्वपक्ष contends that Shruti refers to material Akasha, and fulfils its argument. In the same manner, if on the other hand the insentient in its nature also is dependent on Vishnu, then Vishnu has mastery over its cause of application and hence has reason to be called by that name. And Shruti chiefly purports to refer to Vishnu without any contradiction or opposition. Thus the Sidhantee's argument bears ample fruit.

Now a nyaya called तदधीनत्वन्याय is cited to prove that Brahma is the primary meaning of the word, when dependent. Raghavendra explains this Nyaya at length. This Nyaya occurs in the Adhikarana आनुमानिकमप्येकेषाम् in the Gunasutra तदधीनत्वात् अर्थवत्. The Vishaya vakya is 'अव्यक्तात् पुरुषः परः.' In the adventure of proving all words to refer to Brahma. (सर्वशब्द समन्वय) the question arises of अव्यक्त referring to Brahme. The cause of application अवयवत्व in अव्यक्त

does not inhere in Brahma. Still words meaning अवस्त्व find their full Significance in Brahma; for Subordination of Pradhana is dependent on the will of Brahma. Hence Brahma has claim to be called by that name. On the Strength of this Nyaya, though the Lord does not inhere the nature of Akasha viz hollowness yet he has mastery over that nature of the insentient Akasha. Hence Brahman may be called by the names of insentient things.

But we must further scrutinise whether the nature of Akasha is dependent on God or the nature of elements is dependent on him. This ought to have been our topic of investigation and not if the nature of the insentient is Subordinate to the will of God.

The reply to this objection is to be found in the spirit or the deep meaning underlying the investigation. This Nyaya applies not only to the application of words referring to elements but to all insentient things. The implication is to make the meaning more extensive, of words referring to insentient things depending for their usage on the cause of application or प्रवृत्तिनिमित्त.

On this topic a deeper doubt is entertained. The aforesaid Akasha is a physical element and not Vishnu, either by the mode of convention or of derivation. Rudhi or convention is not proved to operate in respect of Vishnu in an element. Derivation or yoga is neither fixed nor unfixed. Now yoga operates in two ways. The cause of application is hollowness (विवस्त्व) and it is dependent on Vishnu as subordinateness or अवस्त्व is in the case of Pradhana (Primordial cause). Or as in the case of Indra

the cause of application is wealth which the Lord Vishnu inheres. Either the first or the second, must be the reason.

Now in the first alternative it is argued thus—the hollowness of Akasha is not dependent on Vishnu because it is an attribute or nature of a sentient object.

But this reasoning can be counter argued thus, it is an accepted truth that Lord Vishnu has undisputed divine prerogative of every dispensation at his own sweet will. Then how can 'an attribute of an insentient object' rise in power to question this unrestricted authority of Vishnu? Hence the first reason is elucidated in detail. A usage is found that 'the king has won victory' though victory is really won by his army which is subordinate to him. Just in the same manner if the cause of application of a word referring to an insentient object is subordinate to a sentient being the sentient being is not found to be called by the name of the insentient.

No doubt in मृदञ्जवीत् (the earth spoke) we find मृद् OR earth is found used to refer to a sentient being the presiding deity over earth. But by this rule of Presiding deity it must be proved that chetana has mastery over achetana then by the rule of तदधीनत्व the chetana will be called by the name of a chetana. For the Purva pakshin these are not yet proved. Hence the cause of application of a word is not mere freedom of dispensation by the Lord, but it must be the gift earned through the grace of the Lord.

The hollowness or विवर्त्त in Akasha is not a gift earned by Akasha through the grace of the Lord. Therefore all words referring to insentient things must be considered

THE UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS LIBRARY

from the point of view of the cause of application in bearing in the insentient.

In the second alternative that which is the nature is intrinsic and never comes from outside; having such cause of application for which the thing need not depend upon the Lord, the words refer to insentient things and not to the Lord. Here also words having their nature as their cause of application are taken for consideration.

Then this runs Counter to instances quoted in Bhashya, To this objection it is stated that this instance of Akasha is given as it is connected with Anandamayadhikarana in the form of an objection. Then an instance from Meemansa is quoted.

In Jaimini Sutra, I-4-6 there is a Sutra "नामधेये गुण श्रुतेः * स्याद्विधानम्" In vajapeya (which is considered as the name of yaga) as Guna or some attribute is stated, the attribute is enjoined. The point at issue is (वाजपेयेन स्वाराज्य कामो यजेत) whether Vajapeya stated here is some meaningful attribute to be secured or the name of some sacrifice. Take the verb यजेत; the root यज् means यग which having no definite case ending like the accusative is syntactically connected with the termination coming after it meaning some effort (भावना) either as 'object' or as 'means'. (कर्म or करण). But no definite hint there is. Only यग and

* Note— In Prakash this Sutra is said to be in the fifth Adhikarana; but in Bhatta sangraha this Sutra is shown in the sixth Adhikarana by Shri Raghavendra himself.

भावना alone are connoted by the root and termination. But as they come one after another some general Connection is found implicit in them. This is common to both 'object' and 'means'. In respect of object (when याग is construed as object with effort) Guna is construed with the 'means' and फल or purpose is found simultaneously construed (with वाज as some drink, याग should be performed and by याग or Sacrifice स्वाराज्य should be attained). So without any possessive terminations like मनुष्य, याग may be construed with both object and instrument. This requires वाजपेय to be interpreted as some attribute like 'some drink called vaja'. So Vajapeya need not be accepted as the name of the yaga. This is the Purvapaksha.

The sidhanta is that indeterminate connection cannot give rise to specific expectation of either object or instrument; and hence the भावना or effort can neither be construed with object or purpose. If by implication either of these two is indicated then भावना is construed with either of them and not both of them. If simultaneously (यागकर्मिका and याग करणिका भावना) both are construed; then there is connection of both गुण and फल; but such an interpretation (बोधः) leads to two contradictory trinities. Thus the discussion goes on. We are not much concerned here with that. We started with the Purvapaksha argument. His argument is that Akasha is the physical sky and not Brahma or Vishnu. Because the cause of application of the word Akasha is विवरत्न which is the nature of Akasha which is neither the gift of Vishnu nor is under the control of Vishnu. Here all words that have their nature as the

cause of application are under critical review and discussion. Then Akasha should not have been taken here no doubt. But because some instance must be given and Akasha was chosen as it would help us to raise an objection over आनंदमय विकरण. it was taken. In the same manner in Vajapeya Adhikaran though words afore said like उन्निद् and others are to be reviewed yet the word vajapeya is instanced. From this we come to know that विवस्त्व or hollowness is the nature; and hence it cannot be inhered by the Lord nor can it be under the control of the Lord; for it is the nature of Akasha. This Purvapaksha is explained by adducing direct reasons to it.

Many more alternatives are considered in connection with this word Akasha. So far Chendrikakara gathered the chain of thoughts from Anuvyakhyana. Now he epitomises what has been said in Sudha, which is to be considered as a different interpretation. He first repeats what has been said in Sudha; and then explains it as some of its points require clarification. "The hollowness of the sky is not dependent on Iswara unlike wealth of Indra which is dependent on Iswara as it comes from outside. For Akasha is insentient, and hollowness by its very nature is not dependent on Iswara" To make this point more clear it is stated that in the word Indra the effort to rule (over people) constitutes wealth which is the cause of application. The reason for its being dependent on Iswara is knowledge. Here also the same knowledge ought to have been the reason for its dependence on Iswara. And that knowledge is conspicuously absent in insentient Akasha.

Purvapashin is getting stronger For all the reasons adduced by the Sidhanti are being proved null and void. Neither yoga nor Rudhi helps the Sidhanti to rebut the Purvapakshin. Even specially charged Vidvad Rudhi and Maha yoga are spent forces in establishing the meaning of Akasha to be Brahma or Vishnu.

If that is so the Sutrakara merely means to state what has been stated by Anandamayadhikarana. There is no scope for अतस्तदर्थोपदेशात् and the following Adhikaranas. To this the reply is that the coming Adhikaranas are there to meet the additional doubts raised on them. But this goes against the statement of Sudha. For there Vidvad Rudhi and Mahayoga are made available and the additional doubt is raised to cover those things. This is not so, for further we do not find such doubts that cover Vidvadrudhi and Mahayoga. Hence vidvad Rudhi and Mahayoga before the Sidhanti establishes them do not operate. Hence Anuvyakhyana is right in stating like that.

Now the topic is Samanvaya which is achieved through Significant potency (शक्ति) and Verbal import. Samanvaya of all words in Hari so long was discussed on the basis of Significant potency. Now it is discussed on the basis of Verbal import (वाच्यार्थ), which is not found in favour of Vishnu. Before this exclusive Linga had enfeebled the stronger instrument Shruti. Now Shruti manytimes repeated gathers enormous strength over and above its natural strength, over Linga which claims only exclusive (तिरस्कार) application for its qualification. Akasha as physical sky is repeated so many times, that it counteracts the

सामान्यार्थः
वाच्यार्थः
शक्तिः
श्रुतिः
लिंगः
अकाशः
विष्णुः
ब्रह्मः
युगा
रुद्धिः
महायुगा
अतस्तदर्थोपदेशात्
अनुव्याख्यानम्

operation even of exclusive Linga; and meaning of Vishnu is with held. Therefore Indra Shruti is proved to be more powerful for these two reasons its manifoldness and its natural Superiority over Linga. This very Indra Shruti was formerly cited merely as Shruti. Now it is cited here as an instance of manifoldness. The same Shruti can be expressed in different capacities or forms, in different places. For example take (अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति). Does the word अग्निहोत्र connote an attribute or denote the name? This is the doubt. (अग्नये होत्रं हविः अस्मिन्) This is a Bahuvreehi compound and without the complication of possessive termination the attribute is ordained in Namadheyapada. The purvaparksha is that there is the attribute in the form of अग्निदेवता which is associated with अग्निहोत्र. This is the attribute enjoined in the दर्शहोम. If it is a mere name no याग is established in the form of substances and deity, and there is no full realisation of a yaga form.

To this the reply is that when ordinance is possible with the meaning of a root warranted by one word; no other ordinance with the meaning of a different word is necessary. For instance from 'दध्ना जुहोति' and such others we get the substances required and from अग्निज्योतिः and सूर्योज्योतिः we get the names of deities like Agni and Surya. So we can have a fair idea of the form of the yaga. And the word Agnihotra is associated with Agni which occurs in the Mantra. For this reason अग्निहोत्र is a name with a derivative meaning.

Hence तत्परम् चान्यशास्त्रं is the ordinance. In आधारमाचार्यति there is first the doubt whether आधार means some

attribute or merely the name of a yaga or Karma. Then as Purvapaksha आचार is liquid substance like ghee. In आचार्य आचारयति the first आचार्य is ghee and आचारयति tells us that it should be purified.

To this Purvapaksha the reply is that आधार is the name of that yaga in which ghee is poured constantly from one corner to another. Therefore (अग्निहोत्र) आज्य is the Subject and अग्नि is the predicate and this is communiated to us by another Shastra अग्निः ज्योतिः Hence it is the name.

In the same manner the statement दध्नाजुहोति forms a group of Homas or sacrifices. It is doubted if अग्निहोत्रि is one of the constituents of this group. Therefore it is cited as an exception in another context in the second Adhyaya second pada.

Thus there are the instances to prove that one thing may be cited in two places in different forms. This is one solution and the other Solution is the following, Indra and other words connote Vishnu for three reasons. The first instance is* इयेनेनामिचरन्त्यजेत, The word इयेन in the instrumental case by established convention connotes an other meaning. Still it is construed with भावना or effort (the meaning of the termination in यजेत) as the means (the meaning of the root यज् and it fits in the context (इयेनेन यागेन भूयात्) being in the same case with याग. Hence इयेन means some yaga, as again there is some other statement showing some similarity.

In the same manner in मत्सीद्वर्मिदो पवमानब्रिह्मणु, Indra is used in the same case with Vishnu and there is special reference to योदेवानां Hence Indra means Vishnu.

But there is some special consideration too. In the sentence 'इंद्रं विष्णु मत्सि मदयसि' as apposition between Indra and Vishnu is possible with reference to मदयसि, so also both Indra and Vishnu may be construed with मदयसि separately. Then Indra is not Vishnu. But had it been so, just as the verb is repeated with every separate object so also it should have been. इंद्रमत्सि विष्णु मत्सि.

Now the third in stance is cited. In the third Adhyaya fifth pada यदि राज्ञ्यं वैश्यं वा याजयेत् is cited. And if a Kshatriya or Vaisya desires in the ज्योतिष्डोमयागे to drink soma, to him an artificial soma (सोम विकार) should be given and not pure soma. The artificial soma is prepared with fruits of Banyan tree and other things by pounding them. Then it is called फलचमस and that should be given to him to eat (भक्ष) The question is whether this special prescription of Phala chamasa is for eating only or it should be used in the sacrifice also. The purvapaksha is for eating only and not for sacrifice. For it is not stated so in Shruti. Then Sidhanta is that Chamasa Phala is prescribed in the context of yaga as its means. So this artificial soma is prescribed in yaga also.

Here that substance which has created yaga into existence is everlasting; while the occasional which comes after yaga has come into existence and is more powerful than the routine. This phala chamasa which got access into the yaga as something to be eaten in yaga encroaches upon yaga as its Sadhana or means; and gets a sound position in yaga. So also the words like Indra which mean the king of gods enter into Brahman as revealer of its meaning.

Now the Purva Pakstim winds up the long discussion by pointing out the difference in their case. For Akasha has not got any word in apposition; nor does it declare any special Shruti; nor is it conventionally used in any other sense. Hence Akasha is not used in the sense of Vishnu.

The long drawn out defence of Purvapaksha shows the manifold nature of the presentation of the Purvapaksh. But the Sidhanti also faces his argument in all its variety. When it is accepted that every thing is subordinate to the will of Vishnu the cause of application of Akasha cannot be an exception. But आत्मनः आकाशः संभूतः shows that आकाश is produced and hence it is suspected to be physical sky. Hence both physical sky and Vishnu being accepted, it is reconciled that the cause of application being subordinate to Vishnu, Vishnu is primarily connoted while the physical sky is secondarily connoted. Additional doubt is cleared and it is not an old tune. For had this not been stated here no where you would find that आकाश connotes primarily Vishnu.

Still this is a repetition of what has been stated already in Antaryamyadhikarana, where Vishnu is said to be the inner controller of Akasha. Hence thereby it has been proved that Akasha is subordinate to Vishnu. This is not right. For there Akasha was considered as belonging to the group of gods (अधिदेव). There only existence was said to be under the control of Vishnu and not the nature or essence of Akasha. As Akasha is a deity it is not insentient. And the samanvaya of Akasha in Vishnu is not stated.

Here also तत्तु is added to the Sutra taking it from 'तत्तुसमन्वयात्' so Akasha is Vishnu only. As suggested from the Stura which mentions exclusiveness, आकाश connotes Vishnu by the mode of the great yoga or derivation and the conversion of the wise. Thus when sentient Akasha is under the control of Vishnu, much more so is insentient Akasha. For the insentient is more dependent than the sentient.

Hence Insentient Akasha and its nature hollowness also are dependent on Hari's will. It is at the sweet will of Hari that the sky became hollow. Otherwise it would have been solid or thick and God's sovereignty would have been affected.

Now some had argued that hollowness of Akasha is not in Vishnu because it is in the insentient. This argument also is refuted.

As in पंकज the cause of applicability is by convention, settled to be in the Lotus (in पद्मत्वं) So also the cause of applicability of Akasha is by convention settled to be in Akasha. Then how can a word which has its meaning established by convention, in some other thing, can have its meaning, to an unlimited extent, in Vishnu?

The reply is the word Akasha even while meaning physical sky connotes by the mode of derivation. This Chandrikakara illustrates with an instance- सुषेणपार्वणौजुहोति. The word पार्वण is derived (पर्वदेवस्यो होमो) as प्रीयते दीयते अस्मिन् and refers to time of Darsha and Purnamasa. By derivation पर्व means primarily time. And by abstract

derivation it means the sacrifice or Karma preformed. Here it is the locative derivation that is accepted.

So also here even in the meaning of physical sky the mode of interpretation is yoga or derivation. Thus विवस्त्व or hollowness is under the control of Vishnu which ultimately means that God has control even over the nature of things.

Here an instance of Meemanse is quoted. "इन्द्रपीतस्य नराशंसपीतस्य" is a Mantra. In Jyotistoma many offerings are prescribed meant for Indra and non Indra and many gods. The remnants of those offerings (after they eat them) are to be consumed. And a Mantra is to be used for their eating. In the morning a Mantra like वसमदृणस्य is prescribed. But should this be used only when eating the remnants of Indra-Sacrifice or of all others also? that इन्द्रपीतस्य has the word इन्द्र used there and hence it is meant to be used only when remnants of इन्द्र are being consumed is the Purvapaksha. View and not for others in which one should eat without a Mantra.

Then a long discussion ensues through as many as six adhikaranas. Though there is no scope for guessing in respect of Maitravaruna, still many Adhikaranas are employed to institute an argument; hence a special guessing is stated through many Adhikaranas. And discussion is started. In इन्द्रपीतस्य in Sidhanta Bahuvreehiis accepted and hence a special Mantra is there to be used while eating the remnants of offerings to Mitravaruna. So no guessing is necessary. Still guessing is employed to evolve a Nyaya or argument.

Now विवरत्न in Akasha is shown to be in Vishnu and the mode of yoga is established. 'He shines all around' 'He enjoys happiness all round' this derivative meaning is mentioned by Acharya elsewhere. Now the Purvapakshi has agreed to Rudhartha or conventional meaning, which is shown to exist in Brahma. Hence that does not contradict the youngika meaning. Therefore it is not mentioned. Hence also the convention of the meaning is established. For in this sense it has been much used in Veda (विद्वद् is nothing but वैदिकप्रयोगवाहुल्य). Therefore Akasha is primarily used in the meaning of Vishnu. The meaning भूतकाश or physical sky is compatible with अनन्तत्व; No doubt निघंटु mentions अनन्त as the name of the sky and two kinds of अनन्तत्व are found with an unmodified Akasha. These are not found with physical sky as is meant by the Purvapakshi because physical sky has finiteness in three ways (spetious, temporal, and attributive).

It is a strong convention that Vishnu is endless in all three ways by shruti quoted in Bhashya. In the secular world also the name Ananta is one of the three names of him-Achuta, Ananta and Govinda. So the conclusion is that Akasha shruti even on the strength of popular convention is not able to counteract the Linga of Vishnu. For Shruti is powerful by nature and by repetition, while Lingas get strength from exclusiveness finality and multiplicity.

Here a discussion between the grammarian and the Mecmansaka is introduced. For the gramnerions say that when परनित्यांतरंग प्रतिपद विविधपरवलीयस्त्वम् If both पर and

नित्य arise in a context. नित्य is more powerful of the two. When नित्य and अंतरंग arise together अंतरंग is more powerful and when अंतरंग and प्रतिपद arise प्रतिपद is stronger.

पर is पश्चात्तनसूत्र. It is the latter Sutra that operates in preference to the former sutra. Then all these are defined and illustrated. It is finally प्रतिपद that is stronger, which means 'exclusive'. With examples from grammar these are well illustrated.

Again that which is naturally poor in strength but exclusive in application easily counter-acts that which is naturally strong in power but easily applicable else where. An example is supplied by कांस्य भोजिन्याय. In Agrayana Isti there are offerings prescribed to Indra, Agni, Viswedevas and Dyava Prithivee.

There Viswedevas and Dyava prithivee get flowered grass while Indra Agni and others get only grass flowered or un flowered. When the same method is adopted for all, flowered or unflowered grass is accepted for all or flowered grass only for all. When such a doubt arises as a Prima facie it is stated that on account of its prominent and manifold nature unfixed prescription is naturally accepted.

To this Purva Paksha, Sidhanta is that unfixed Prescription is no definite prescription. But you can prescribe mere grass and it is in no way affected even when the grass is flowered, for it is not defective. An unfixed prescription wrongs the nature of Dyava-Prithivee. When untainted is possible no tainted is prescribed. So grass with flowers is prescribed. This is the sidhanta. This prescription of flowers is illustrated by the rule of कांस्यभोजिन्याय.

A preceptor with a disciple had observed a vow. The disciple had the vow of eating from a bell metal plate while the preceptor had no such rule. But when both were found to dine in one place, for the sake of uniformity the preceptor also was induced to accept a bell metal plate.

Just as the case of the disciple was not strong as the case of Guru; still Guru was made to change his plate in order to save shishya from the breach of vow, though his case was poor. So also shruti naturally stronger than Ling and upholding Physical sky **भूताकाश** could not counteract Vishnu as his Linga is exclusive. Hence Akasha should mean Vishnu and not the physical sky.

Even the 'identity' interpretation is not the right one. The Advaitin contends that Akasha means only conditioned Brahma. Here he is mentioned that he should be meditated upon.

In order to refute his arguments Raghavendra goes to the text itself in order to find the context in which 'आकाश इतिहोवाच' occurs. Now this is a reply which should be in conformity with the question.

Now in Chandogya, first Adhyaya, three are said to be very conversant in उद्गीत one is shilaka shalavatya, and the second is Chaikitayanaya Dalbhya and the third is Prawahana Jaibili. They declared that they were conversant in Udgeetha, then shalavatya began to tell a story in Udgeetha. He then asked **कासां गतिः**. Dalbhy replied 'अयं लोकः' or असौ लोकः. when again it was asked **अमुष्य लोकस्य का गतिः** it was replied **अयं लोकः** meaning there by that the earth was the support. Now the question is not about the earth. It is about the whole universe. Had

it been about the earth the reply would have been आपः 'water'. For the earth had come out of water.

Now the reply is आकाश इति होवाच and it is in conformity with the question about all worlds. So Bhamatikara says that the reply is interpreted in accordance with the question. And if according to reply the question is to be interpreted then there is mutual interdependence.

Coming to the Advaiti point of view, if आकाश is something (विशिष्ट) qualified with attributes that cannot be अनंत or endless. For विशिष्ट has an end. If Shudha Brahma is Akasha then we cannot attribute to him such qualities as ज्यायस्त्व.

Besides the mark mentioned in the Sutra is not really to be found in Brahman. If on the other hand that mark is unreal or mithya then Brahmatva proved by it also is false or mithya. Then what the Purvapakshee says would be proved to be true.

Raghavendra adds a note here. Some foolish talk is indulged in that, as in the Shruti आकाशात् वायुः it is physical sky that is the cause of wind, so also here in आकाश इति होवाच also it is physical sky that is meant. But this आकाश is the cause of all and has the characteristic (of shiva) and hence it is shiva that is different from the great sky who is called by the word Akasha.

This idea is repudiated by the argument that the physical sky is the cause for all physical things. And this Akasha is found in apposition to the word Ananta which is among the three names of Vishnu. (अन्यत, अनंत and

गोविंद). The couception of a shiva being the universal cause runs counter to the Smṛiti "विष्णुः आकाशनामकः." Many statements quoted in Bhashya contradict this thought. All marks are proved by Bhashya to refer to Vishnu alone.

अन्यत्र प्रसिद्ध ब्रह्मणि समन्वयः; Supplies all connections

अन्यत्र प्रसिद्धनाम्नः; ब्रह्मणिसमन्वयः; supplies all connections.
ब्रह्मणि shows Shastra Sangati; समन्वय shows Adhyaya Sangati; अन्यत्र प्रसिद्धनाम्नः shows Pada Sangati.

PRANADHIKARANAM

अतएवप्राणः

SUTRA : Prana is Vishnu for the same reason only. For having the mark of Shreepatitva— (for being the Lord of Shree).

BHASHYA : Oh Vishnu ! Because you will give, have given and gave great joy to Prajapati; (Therefore you are full of perfect joy. Because you actuated nine gods (of senses), and you actuate and you will do so; therefore you are said to be Prana,

Thus by the use of the word (महान् भोगः) 'great delight' Prana is said to be full of bliss.

Prana who is said to be full of bliss shall have to be Mukhya Vayu, on account of its well-known popularity.

But this is not so. Because Vishnu alone is Prana.

On account of the clear mark of Vishnu, "Shree and Lakshmi are both your wives. The deities of day and night (the sun and the moon) are by the side." This and others are his (invariable) mark).

Thus ends Pradhanadhikarana.

BHAVADEEPA : Raghavendra appreciates the note made by Teekā about the arrangement of the Adhikarana. Here the Sutra itself is stated at the beginning. And Raghavendra notes that this should be the arrangement everywhere. For the Sutra that is to be commented upon, must be declared at the beginning. Afterwards the subject matter and other things should be mentioned. No doubt in some places thought-links are supplied first. And that is to facilitate the understanding of the readers. Hence one should not be rash enough to declare that the present one is no new Adhikarana because there is no thought-link and other things.

Now this Adhikarana is connected with Anandamayadhikarana and the topic-statements (विषयवाक्य) are also connected. In that Adhikarana Vishnu was said to be fully blissful. And here also some Prana is said to be माहाभोग in the same meaning. भुज् in Bhashya means भोगान्.

प्राण when derived from प्राणति or जं वंते अनेन इति प्राणः refer to प्राण with whose help all beings breathe. If this

Prana is some body other than Vishnu, then Anandamaya also would be some one else. For unexcelled perfect joy belongs to only one (एकमेवाद्वितीयम् ब्रह्म) and not to two. Therefore who is that Purnananda should be settled.

Vayu is Mukhya Prana and he is the Prana according to PurvaPaksha. For he is heard so in Shruti. But there is the Linga like लक्ष्मीपतिव in favour of Vishnu. But this Linga is not exclusive. All Jeevas including Prajapati depend for all their pleasures upon Mukhya Prana. And even Lakshmipatitva can be adjusted some how through derivation to qualify Mukhyavayu. There is no other Linga that is exclusively applicable to Vishnu which is able to counter-act Shruti of Vayudeva.

But even admitting exclusiveness of Linga referring to Vishnu, and admitting Prana Shruti without being scathed by any contradiction, they place Purva Paksha on a sound basis by declaring PranaShruti to be exclusively referring to Prana or Vayu. For Prana is not found to refer to Vishnu anywhere by convention.

But there is one objection. The chief Vayu is invisible and therefore how can one prove positive concomitance of Life and Vayu and negative concomitance of absence of Vayu and absence of Life. But though perception cannot help the invariable concomitance of Vayu and Life to be proved; yet verbal testimony can prove it. Both Shruti and Smriti uphold this view.

Now Shidhanti begins his attack. प्राणस्तु means Prana is Vishnu only. For he is said to be the Lord of Lakshmi. In तैत्तिरीय the reading is ह्रीश्चतेलक्ष्मीश्च; But श्रीश्चतेलक्ष्मीश्च

is another reading in another branch. Vishnu is known to have only one wife. But there are two names on account of the difference of place she occupies. Shree occupies Vishnu's chest and Lakhmee occupies his lap. But in Tattvapradeepa अंकाश्रिताश्री while Lakhmee resorts to his chest. This is the traditional view; and a verse is quoted to corroborate this view.

The Linga of लक्ष्मीपतित्व is powerful on account of its exclusive reference to Vishnu, as expressed by एव in the Sutra and explained by Sudha to that effect. For Lakshmee and other words have no other referents than Vishnu and it is not right to push aside the prominent meaning to give place to an unimportant Sense. Besides it should not be derived to mean, a mean meaning. Prana is clearly and unequivocally used with reference to Vishnu in Shruti. In Kathaka it is Stated that इतरेण तु जंवाति where इतरेण refers to Vishnu. For just before that, it is stated मध्येवामनमासीनम् where the word वामन and after that, in गुह्यब्रह्मसनात्तनम् the word ब्रह्म refers to Vishnu. येनजातानि जीवन्ति carries the parallel meaning.

No doubt here the two forms of Mukhya Prana are said to be only subordinate to the Lord and not the cause of life on the world. On the other hand Prana is denied that attribute But Prana is said to have five functions (चञ्चवृत्तिः) and there Mukhya Prana is admitted to be the cause of life. But Prana is not given a free hand in that work Taking the support of Vishnu Prana engages himself in the operation of life. Life operates chiefly at the suggestion and guidance of Hari through Prana.

Therefore the Sutra runs as “प्राणः तत्तु” Prana is that (Vishnu) only i.e. all words referring to internal senses mean chief Vishnu. Prana is the chief among them and has the mark formerly objected to. Hence the word Prana is mentioned bodily in the Sutra.

TANTRADEEPIKA : In this Adhikarana (Pranadhi-karana) all the words meaning senses or internal organs (अध्यात्म) are shown to refer to Vishnu. Prana is mentioned as the chief among them and implying the whole group. In Shruti it is stated तद्वैत्वं प्राणः and that प्राण (अतएव प्राणः) is Brahma only and not Mukhya Prana by convention. Why? Only for that reason श्रीरुचते लक्ष्मीरुचपत्न्यो (Shree & Lakshmee are your wives). On account of लक्ष्मीपतित्व. The word एव in the Sutra suggests the exclusiveness of the above Linga or Mark.

NYAYA MUKTAVALI

अतएव प्राणः

In this Adhikarana too there is assimilative connection bringing the old into operation in a new context. Or as a new prima facie view is raised it is the connection of counter-instance, or it is the link of discussion in the order of Shruti.

In तत्तरीयक it is heard तद्वैत्वं प्राणः; now the doubt is whether this Prana is Mukhya Vayu or Vishnu. Purva Paksha is that Prana is Mukhya Vayu— 1) because there is convention to that effect; 2) No doubt exclusive Linga is

against it yet there is no convention for Prana to mean Vishnu; 3) The chief Vayu is the cause of life in beings on the evidence of Shruti and Smriti. Now this Vayu is the body of Mukhya Prana; and is the cause of life as the body of the potter is the cause of pot. Hence Prana is not Vishnu. This is Purva Paksha.

Now the Sidhanta is that Prana has the invariable and exclusive mark of लक्ष्मीपतित्व which cannot be set aside. Besides there is the pronoun 'your' in श्रीश्चते as in तद्वैत्वंप्राणः and अमृतत्व (immortality) is heard of him.

Now about Mukhya Prana being the cause of life both by positive and negative concomitance between them—Vayu being the body of Mukhya Prana and in the same manner Mukhya Prana too is the body of Vishnu, whatever is invariably concomitant with Mukhya Prana is so with Vishnu also. Prana is said to be प्राणस्य प्राणः and therefore is Vishnu both by derivation and convention. In हीश्चते लक्ष्मीश्च; ही is Shree only on the Strength of this another Shruti.

The purpose for this discussion is that आनन्दमय was doubted to belong some महाभोग which means पूर्णानन्द, This महाभोग is doubted to be Prana or Vayu and then proved to be Vishnu. And AnandaMaya also is Vishnu.

TATTVAMANJARI— It is not reasonable to say in Anandamayadhikarana that Brahma or Vishnu is Purnananda or perfectly blissful. For in तद्वैत्वंप्राणः. Prana is stated to be Mahabhoga or Purnananda. And this Prana in Popular parlance is known to be Mukhya Prana. It is

self contradictory to state that two are perfectly blissful. To this the rejoinder is "अतएव प्राणः".

It is interpreted as प्रणेता in Anubhashya. This प्रणेता means 'Cause of Life' जीवनहेतुः. By implication Prana having all qualities of Atma like प्रणेतृत्व 'giver of life', is chiefly Vishnu only. Therefore all Adhyatma words like Prana which popularly connote other thing than Vishnu refer to Vishnu alone and not to Mukhya Prana.

Why? सर्वगुणत्वतः— all the qualities described here belong to Vishnu only. ह्रीश्चतैलक्ष्यच describes his being the husband of Shree and Lakshmee. चर्तान्नविद्यमाणः describes his being the sustainer of the world. Hence all the qualities in this context belong to Vishnu. Why so? Because (सर्वगुणत्वतः) यदेवान् प्राणयोनव in the remaining part of the sentence, Nava devas imply that he is the cause of life of all beings; and has mastery over the cause (of all beings) inhering in others. In the place of प्राण, प्रणेता is used in order to suggest that the word Prana refers to Hari through Mahayoga mode of interpretation. The word एक shows that it refers most primarily to Vishnu alone.

PRAKASHA— Prana as the implicator of all Adhyatmika words is shown to refer to Vishnu. The connecting link is अतिदेश or extension of the previous rule to the present context. The cause of application of the word Prana is the cause of life. This by positive and negative concomitance is to be found in Vayu. So the word Prana refers to Vayu; and not to Vishnu. This is the additional doubt and by the extension of the rule of Anvaya

Vyatiṛe' a this doubt is cleared. But if Prana is different from Vishnu (in तद्वैत्वं प्राणः) Mahabhoga also is different and Anandamaya also is different. If this is the Purva Paksha then Siddhanta is nothing more than the solution of this.

But the reverse of this also can be proved. For Brahma was formerly ascertained to be Vishnu; who was determined to be Anandamaya. Now this Anandamaya is Purnananda. The Present Prana is said to be Purnananda. Therefore it is easily proved that Prana is Vishnu. Hence this cannot be the purpose.

But this is not reasonable. For Linga in favour of Vishnu has easy references to others while Pranati Shruti is exclusive in references to Vayu. Even the word Brahma some how can be made to refer to Mukhya Prana. And according to rule of Purva Paksha, the word Brahma, being heard in association with Prana Shruti which refers to others may be referred to other than Vishnu or to Vayu.

Again an objection might be raised. If this Prana is other than Vishnu here, (तद्वैत्वं प्राणः) then in प्राणदेवा अन् प्राणति निश्च Prana might be other than Vishnu. No doubt, thus objecting (प्राणमय) and explaining that objection would be a sound purpose. Then why should one take recourse to a round about way through the objection or महाभोग? But the former could depend himself by saying that तद्वैत्वं प्राणः was not chosen because here there is no possibility of collecting a multitude of प्राणश्रुति; and there no special reason could be adduced. Hence that objection was not raised.

But this is not a sound reply. For a thing settled in one place, if there is no opposition, holds good everywhere. But there is opposition because it refers to Vishnu. Yet this reference to Vishnu is not a settled fact. May not be! but Brahma is said to be the resort of the released souls and this constitutes a sound opposition. But this mark of Brahma may refer to other things elsewhere also as here.

Even this be true in the Sutra it is verbally said that the objection is based on Anandamaya and hence the objection is raised through महाभोग. That is why Bhashya has adopted this course of objection and reply.

This is not the only reason; Raghavendra adds by implication another reason. If the objection is not raised through महाभोगत्व, then महाभोगत्व is settled to be an exclusive attribute of Vishnu. Then it is but natural that Vishnu alone might be doubted to be Prana. There should be no scope for such a doubt. There is objection based on महाभोगत्व in order to show that महाभोगत्व is also an attribute of Vayu.

Here it was objected that Vishnu was Prana on account of his being Anandamaya. Hence it is not a repetition. Nor the word Prana has reference to both Vayu and Vishnu. For there was an objection raised against finding the cause of application of Prana in Vishnu.

Now the topic is discussed. The doubt is whether Prana is Mukhya Vayu or Brahma. Raghavendra prepares the course of thinking and presents it. It must be considered whether Prana is Mukhya Vayu or Brahma. Do you find the invariable marks of Brahma to prove its being Brahma,

in Prana or not? For that purpose there is the consideration of *मतीसन्प्रियमाणः*. When Prana is other than Vishnu, and there is no mark of Brahma in it to prove its Brahmatva, Prana is Vayu only. This is Purva Paksha Phala. When Prana does not refer to Vayu then there is surely the mark of Brahma. And the result is Brahma in Sidhanta.

Here the process of Purva Paksha runs thus. The word Prana popularly refers to Vayu only and hence Prana is Vayu only, and not Vishnu. No doubt by exclusive marks the popular usage is rendered null and void; yet the cause of application of the word Prana is 'the cause of Life' and that is by positive and negative concomitance is invariably found in Vayu alone. This is an additional doubt which raises the *Prima facie* view of the subject.

But this is not reasonable. For we must think in Purva Paksha if prana is insentient or physical Vayu or the deity Mukhya Vayu. The first one is of no use. For you cannot address an insentient or lifeless Vayu as 'त्वं प्राणोभवः' 'you were Prana'. But there is such an address to Lifeless, 'Oshadhi' as 'आषवेनायस्व'. This Oshadhi in our Sidhanta refers to the Presiding deity over Oshadhi. And in Meemamsa, wherever insentient Plants or stones are called for protection it is only to instil energy in the activity.

Nor the second alternative of Mukhya Prana is found tenable. For life is seen nothing but the modification of Vayu by its presence and absence; and hence as there is no special presence and absence of the modification of Vayu which would make it Mukhya Vayu. Besides Prana or Vayu might be accepted as insentient and just as Akasha though

insentient is attributed with Blissfulness and other things. So also Vayu though insentient might be 'addressed' to, taking into consideration its presiding deity.

But this sort of argument would bring hornet's nest of counter arguments. To all this the Purva Pakshakara replies convincingly. The alternative of jada or being insentient he would not accept. The other alternative of being sentient[†] he would accept. And the objections raised against it are squarely met with.

No doubt we cannot perceive the absence of Mukhya Prana (who is imperceptible) for the presence and absence of life. Yet Vedic statements like— 'When that Prana enters, he stood up' and 'when the Prana departs he fell down'— would prove that Prana is Mukhya Vayu.

But in the Sutra प्राणस्तथानुगमात् a न्याय or rule is followed by which Prana is proved to be Vishnu and not Mukhya Vayu. This Sutra comes at the end of this Pada. The Sidhanta of that Sutra is based on this Sutra. Therefore it is not possible to counter argue the Purva Paksha of this Sutra on the strength of the Sidhanta of that Sutra. So the doubt that Prana is Vishnu cannot be raised at this stage.

If priority and posteriority are not taken into account one will be reduced to absurdity of the following type. In स्वर्गकामाधिकरण the फल is established and in Bhavadhikarana after a doubt is entertained whether the means of that फल is the sense of भावना or the sense of the name, a Sidhanta is to be arrived at. Before that a prima facie view that there is no Phala cannot be entertained at all. Because in Swarga Kamadhikarana Phala would be established.

So long Prana was considered Mukhya Prana on the ground that he is the cause of life on the evidence of the verbal statement, according to Teeka. Now according to Sudha Mukhya Prana is considered the cause of life on the strength of perception. For just as the body of the potter is the cause of the pot by the law of invariable concomitance (both positive and negative); So also Vayu, the physical body of Mukhya Prana is the cause of life by the same law of invariable concomitance. Concomitance of body is perceptible and hence the one possessing body is easily known to be the cause. This also proves that Teeka and Sudha concur in producing the evidence of perception in respect of Mukhya Vayu being the cause of life. For the word दर्शनात् is used in Teeka which means known through perception. Smrities are quoted there as additional evidences adduced to prove Prana to be Mukhya Vayu. But Prana is not Brahma. For Brahma is Sarvagata or ubiquitous and disembodied (सर्वगतं सुसूक्ष्मं अशरीरं प्रजात्मा). Therefore the absence of life in us is not due to absence of Brahma or his body.

But in Aksharadhikarana, Brahma is going to be stated atomic. Hence his absence might as well cause the absence of Life. This objection is not sound. For the absence of life requires atomicness unaccompanied by ubiquity.

In some places no doubt, Brahma is stated to have body when his immanence is to be stated. But this embodiedness is not real but figurative and absence of a figurative body cannot cause the absence of Life in us.

But another objection is raised. In भ्रूमासप्रसादात् exit of Life is mentioned. (उत्क्रास्तप्राणान्). From this exit Prana

is considered to be Vayu only. But next to that, Prana is described as having perfect happiness. And that exit is thus possible even with Vishnu. And hence Prana is Vishnu only: and by his absence, the absence of life might be caused.

This objection is repudiated by stating that Vishnu or Brahma, by his potential power of infinite extensiveness though remains in the body yet by his assumed and manifested atomic nature quits the body. Therefore the absence of Vishnu either prrceptible or verbally warranted does not cause the absence of Life. Therefore it is conclusively proved that by the presence or absence of Vishnu the presence or absence of Life can be said to be caused.

Therefore Brahma cannot claim to be the cause of Life (जीवन). Nor any other subordinate to Brahma is the cause of Life. Therefore Prana is Mukhya Vayu only; and he happens to be perfectly blissful (आनन्दमय). Hence the additional doubt based on the invariable concomitance (both positive and negative) is perfectly justified.

Now the Sidhanta or conclusion begins repudiating the Prima facie view. But though there is nothing to be found as basis in the Sutra for this repudiation; yet (अतएव) प्राणः तत् has this implication. First as entertained in Anuvya-khyana, the doubt that Vishnu is not the cause of life by invariable concomitance, is taken up for consideration.

Now the Sidhanta is that just as Vayu being the body of Prana, Mukhya Vayu becomes the cause of life on account of the invariable concomitance, in the same manner Mukhya Vayu also is the body of Vishnu and is invariably

concomitant with Life; And hence Vishnu also is the Cause of Life.

This point of View removes the objection that Vishnu being disembodied, his absence cannot be proved in our bodies. For Prana is body and hence (when Prana departs) there is his absence in our body.

Now the doubt that in our body there cannot be his absence because Vishnu is ubiquitous, is considered in Bhumadhikarana. The explanation is that Vishnu is potentially ubiquitous but when there is no life in the body Vishnu is not there in the special form actually.

Thus so long the cause of application of the word Prana is 'The cause of life'. And that is shown to be found in Vishnu. Now according to Teeka, this cause of life though found with some other than Vishnu; yet it is found under the control of Vishnu. For it is only the undisputed and unshared authority over the cause of life that is Prana. Bhagavan alone can be such a source of life without being contested by any body.

But if Prana is Vishnu then Laxmee and others, would be the wives of Prana. But this is not a sound objection. For there are many words like "Lakshmee, Shree and Hree" And they are not used in composition as wives of Prana.

Now Prana, as stated in shruti, refers to the famous Prana. Does that mean that Prana refers to Vayu or to Brahma? Purva Pakshakara argues that Prana refers to Vayu for the following reasons— 1) It has conventional reference to the famous Prana 2) Prana refers to Vayu at the beginning where no opposition has yet arisen.

3) Brahma is referred to at the end where it is already set with contradictory statements hence this is poor in strength. Therefore Prana is Mukhya Vayu

Prana at the beginning, no contradictory statement being in operation, is enquired— "What is that deity ?". Hence Prana is some Sentient Devata. So he is Brahma. If by Rudhi or Convention Prana is made to refer to Vayu; the answer will not be in conformity with the question. For it is stated that all beings enter into Prana. In Vayu, entrance of all beings is not consistent. Hence Prana refers to Brahma only

Another objection that all this has already been discussed in Akashadhi Karana and that hence it should not have been again started, is met with the statement that a deeper doubt has actuated the writer to enter into this new Adhi Karana.

In यदा वै पुरुषः स्वप्निति all Bhutas are stated to enter into Prana and get themselves absorbed in it. But यतोवा भूतानि states that the Bhutas get absorbed into Brahman. When this doubt arises, यदा वै पुरुषः proves that at the time of sleep all Bhutas enter into Prana. One cannot object that this sleep statement does not refer to the famous Prana. At the time of sleep the function of life has not stopped, but the function of senses has ceased. And at the time of waking up, the senses again begin to function. Hence perception and inference both agree with what is stated; and we cannot state that the sleep statement is not about the great Vayu.

But sleep statement describes (यदा वै पुरुषः स्वप्निति) absorption of senses into Prana while यतोवा भूतानि describes the

entrance of Bhutas or elements into Brahma. So how one is related with the other ?

There is no such incongruity between the two, because the senses are essentially made up of elements and so even in sleep statement absorption of elements is ultimately meant.

One is prone to make a nice distinction that in Prastava Vakya (यतोवा इमानि भूतानि) it is stated that all elements get absorbed into Brahman and hence sleep-statement should be led in purport so as to conform to Prastava Vakya.

But sleep statement is strongly endorsed by perception and inference and hence not only easily over rides the claims of Prastava Vakya, but leads it to follow the import of sleep-statement and ultimately concludes that all elements get absorbed into Prana. This is the additional doubt considered here.

But it is again objected that this is not an additional doubt. For just as on the strength of sleep-statement, the famous Prastava Vakya is said to refer to the great Prana; So also formerly by the force of Sambhuta Vakya, in the sentence आकाशादेव, the Akasha means 'the elements'. Such a doubt may arise. Therefore this is not an additional doubt.

This objection is not fair. For the sentence आकाशात् वायुः is not corroborated by other evidences. Hence according to it सर्वाणिभूतानि आकाशादेव does not refer to the physical sky which is the cause of Vayu only. This is the additional doubt; and this is cleared in the following manner. The

sentence 'यदादुरुषः स्वपिति' is powerful and powerless according as it has been endorsed or not by other evidences. Therefore the sleep-statement is not powerful. Hence according to it the Prastava Vakya does not refer to Prana. But according to यतोवा which constitutes the sure sign of Brahma that sleep-statement refers to Brahma.

A man-made statement depends for its strength on corroboration of other evidences. But in Apoursheya Vakya which is not open to doubt strength and weakness do not depend upon the presence or absence of corroboration. Therefore Bhamatikara also upheld this view.

But this is not just. For in the Purvapaksha when it was asked if Prana were to be insentient Vayu, देवता was used in its context and देवता is चेतन or sentient. And the presiding deity of जडवायु may be sentient.

But this supposition runs counter to Bhamatikara's elucidation of Purva Paksha that Vayu undergoes modification into five functions and that Prana is justified in being its material cause. As there is no corroborating evidences to sleep-statement either Purvapaksha or Sidhanta cannot be based upon it.

Bhamatikara contends that there is corroborating evidence to the sleep-statement. For the senses get absorbed into Prana, as prana is functioning even in sleep; While the senses are defunct. That which has ceased to function enters and gets absorbed in that which is functioning, like the one that is accepted commonly. Thus inference is the corroborating evidence.

But in the same manner यतोवाचो also commands corroborative evidence and stands stronger. Hence no question of weakness arises. Besides, it may not be objected that there is no corroborative evidence to Brahman being the receptacle for the absorption of the Bhutas though there is evidence to its being the material cause of those elements.

This is not fair. For there is no necessity of such an evidence. Because the real evidence is that it is a material cause which is the real receptacle for absorption. Besides there is no concomitance that a non operating thing gets absorbed into an operating thing, for want of an instance. And this is fallacious reasoning. For in the sleep-state God is there functioning in the body and yet the senses are not considered to get absorbed into Him. Or a common sense fallacy of this sort of reasoning might be shown. A hand dagger that is active is not the receptacle of absorption in it of a sword that is idle in the scabbard.

Again "which is that deity? It is Anna," "that deity depends upon Pratihara." Now this Anna and others are seen as different from Brahman. In the same way Prana also is some thing different from Brahma. This is a new doubt, newly solved. This is the topical sentence quoted in the Purva Adhikarana. "कालाम्ना गतिः इति । स्वरः इति होवाच । स्वरस्य का गतिः इति । प्राण इति होवाच । प्राणस्य का गतिः इति । अन्नमिति होवाच " Thus Dalbhya replied when asked by Shalavatya, that Swarga was the गति. But his reply was considered baseless and hence his view was discarded. Then Dalbhya again asked the question 'अमृष्यलोकस्य का गतिः' and 'अयं लोकः' was the answer given by Shalavatya to Dalbhya

His view also was discarded by Jaibili. Then Shalavatya asked 'अस्यलोकस्य कागति' And the reply was आकाश इति होवाच'.

Here an objection is raised. In statements like 'अस्यलोकः' there are no marks of Brahma. And hence they do not find any support; and they were discarded. Swarga and other statements too have no references to Brahman. But Akasha has been the cause of all Bhuthas or elements; and this is surely a mark of Brahman. प्रायपाठ or abundant repetition comes to settle the meaning if there is any doubt. Here there is no doubt.

So here also 'the elements enter' which is a sure mark of Brahman. Let this also refer to Brahman. Because both the cases are similar. Hence there is no additional doubt according to the arrangement of Adhikarana of Bhamatikara. And hence the method of Sidhantakara according to him also is refutable. The Prastava Statement should follow either sleep-statement or causal statement (यतोवा इमानि भूतानि.) If mere "entrance of Bhutas" is the determinant factor it is merely the repetition of the former statement. Though both the statements are authorless (अपीरुद्धेय), yet according to the Purvapakshi the sleep-statement being endorsed by another evidence should be followed. Therefore in the Bhamatikara's arrangement of Adhikarana the Prastava Vakya refers to the famous Prava and hence the Prima facie view of the Purvapakshi stands uncontradicted. This is the rule of common sense view. But the corroborative evidence if invalid cannot render the original instrument valid. For this invalidity must be defined. Does that mean

merely letting know what is known (ज्ञातार्थकत्वं) or the need of some other evidence to corroborate.

A decisive definition of validity is offered to show what is invalidity. Uncontrodicted nature of the subject matter which is what is exactly meant by correspondence (याथार्थ्यं) is validity and not, as others define it, the knowledge of an unknown thing.

So, now some had argued that once a thing had been proved to be true by a valid instrument of knowledge; then no corroborative evidence was necessary. But this is not warranted. For even when well proved, its reliability might be doubted and the corroborative evidence might clear that doubt and keep its validity beyond doubt.

As regards the second alternative of the necessity of some other evidence to corroborate the validity, the sleep-Statement (यदावं गुरुषः स्वप्निति) does not require the aid of other evidences to express its meaning. But there is happily by chance a corroborative evidence springing up. This does not prove its need of a corroborative evidence.

Thus the argument continues till the Chandrikara reaches the conclusion that the interpretation of the Adhikarana as found by others is not satisfactory. Then he takes up for critical review the interpretation by Ramanuja. In the statement "प्रस्नोत्तर्या देवता" Prana is referred to as the source of all dispensations of the world. It is doubted whether this Prana is the famous Prana or Paramatman. Prima facie view is that Prana is the famous Prana. But the Sidhanti contends that insentient things like stones and

wood never depend upon Prana. Hence this runs against 'सर्वाहिवा इमानि भूतानि प्राणमेवमाभिसंविराति'. For the word 'सर्व' or all is used here.'

This sort of Puryapaksha is not justified For the Purvapakshakara never raises a doubt that all depend on the Prana for their activity. Because the Purvapakshakar has seen with his own eyes bodies that depend upon Prana for their activities, as well as bodies that do not depend upon Prana for their activities.

JYOTIRADHIKARANA

BHASHYA :

(By the sentence in Matravarṇa 'यो वेदनिहितं गुहायां' who knows one placed in the cave) some one placed in the Cavity was referred to. 'My ears turn away; so also my eyes from the light that is placed in the heart. My mind wandered far away. Poor as I am in understanding, what shall I say or think of that light.' Thus some light is referred. That light is easily understood to be Agni, because the hymn is dedicated to Agni and is also popularly known to be so. Therefore it said :-

ज्योतिः चरणाभिधानात् (I-2-14)

That which is expressed by the word Jyotiḥ is Brahma only and not anything else. For ears and eyes are said to wander away.

BHAVADEEP

Just before in the Sutra मांत्रवणिकमेवचगीयते some मंत्रवर्ण contained योवेदनिहितंगुहायां in which the thing that was kept in the cavity of the heart was itself आनंदमय. That itself is called ज्योतिः in विमेकणपितयः. The preposition वि is connected with the verb (root). पृथगतः is पपतः; there is कृप after चक्षुर्वी and this कृप is the modification of स्वरित accent and means 'excess'. दूर आधीः though one word consists of two parts; and they must be separately construed. दूर goes with विचरित. "Because the mind wanders away therefore I am poor in understanding". But in Tattvapradeepa it is construed differently, taking दूर and आधीः together. 'Having an all round and far reaching comprehension.

'If this Jyoti is Agni shows this Adhikarana to be an objection to the previous one. Purvapaksha is Jyoti is 'Agni'. Jyoti means merely 'antagonist to darkness'; but here it has the mark of being placed in the heart and there is also (स्वामन्त्रेतमसि) the Shruti; Hence there is no scope for the other meaning (than Agni). So it is Agni, on account of its popular vogue (Only when no discrimination of power of connotation is taken into consideration). Here Purvapaksha is mainly based on Shruti and the context of Agni Sukta is cited only as additional strength

Here a doubt arises. If this Jyoti Shrtui has Agni for its deity, by the rule of immanence the deity is Vishnu who is immanent in Jyoti; if on the other hand Jyoti is some physical thing, then by the rule made use of in the Akashadhikarana Jyoti is Vishnu.

Purvapakshi replies that though Shruti gives scope for different interpretation, no one can challenge the authenticity and publicity of this Sukta as AgniSukta and not Vishnu Sukta. The great teachers of Veda have maintained this Vogue and it can in no way be explained away. Thus Sukta is exclusively Agni Sukta. कर्णपूरत्व and other things should be made to qualify only Agni and not Vishnu,

Now Sidhanta begins:— (ज्योतिः तत् चरणोभिधानात्) Sutra should be read with तत्. Jyoti is Vishnu only. (Because विचरणाभिधानात् Bhashya interprets Sutra so as to reduce the Sutra statement to syllogistic form. Jyoti is Paksha and Vishnu is Sadhya and विचरणाभिधानात् is Hetu. Bhashya further shows that hetu and Sadhya are found together in the Paksha, which makes the path to conclusion easy.

In the Sutra mere चरण is used without the suffix वि a proposition. Its propriety is explained in Chandrika. Now in Shruti पतन is the first mention. (The root पत् mentioned among स्पृहृगृह् and others belongs to 10th conjugation. पत् + अत् and ष्वत् we get पतन्, along with ears. So it is कर्णादिविदूरत्व (going away from ears and others). But this is not mentioned in the Sutra. How the ears going away from Light (ज्योतिः) is not clear. While चरण is closely associated in the Shruti; and it is the important activity of the mind. So, पतन does arise in the context at all and चरण is used in the Sutra.

Here Purvapaksha is based on Shruti and Prakarana. How this can be rebutted merely by Linga? When Shruti and Linga are both equivocal, the same, pure and unequi-

vocal, are more powerful. This is the law of interpretation well worked out in Nyayavivarana. Applying the same rule here we decide under the guidance of Asmarathya (in the coming Sutra), that what is called Agni Sukta formally devoted to Agni; but it is really consecrated to Vishnu presiding over Agni. No doubt in popular parlance it is declared to be not a Vishnu Sukta; because it is not titled so or it is the common ignorance of the people. But any how it is not due to the fact that Vishnu is not described there in. Or the case may be decided according to the rule of inner controlling power.

To the objection that the Shruti is accepted as Agni Sukta by common convention; hence if at all to be accepted as formally referring to Vishnu and not mainly, the reply is that the cause of application of the word Jyoti is Light which is most comprehensively true with Vishnu; either because it is its inherent quality, or even when it belongs to others, Vishnu has undisputed authority over it. Both Smrities and Shruties support amply both these aspects of theory; and thus prove the (Vedic) convention by abundance of usage of Jyoti referring to Vishnu.

Thus चरणभिन्नतात् means that there is the mention of exclusive mark of Charana. By logical implication it means that 'on account of the respective exclusive marks mentioned in the different Shruties.'

NYAYA MUKTAVALI

Purvapeksha is raised in a different manner; so this link is called counter instance; or the link is based on Shruti process. In the Shruti विमेकर्णितयो same ज्योति

is cited. The doubt is whether this is Agni or Vishnu. Purvapeksha is that it is Agni. For Jyoti Shruti is Conventionally accepted as devoted to Agni. Though Jyoti only means 'dispeller of darkness' yet because it is placed in the cavity of the heart and there is Shruti 'हवामग्नेतमसि' where Agni is explicitly expressed and it is not applied to any thing else. As formerly Shruti is not contradicted by exclusive Linga. For there is much difference between the two. Prana Shruti is not countenanced by Vayu Sukta; while this Shruti is favoured by Agni Sukta (in the form of context)

An objection is raised against this Purvapaksha. Suppose the Shruti refers to elements or according to rule of Akashanaya it refers to some deity. Then they create occasion for reference to Vishnu; and when Agni is Vishnu, Agni Sukta also is Vishnu Sukta. Thus by exclusive Linga both of them are contacted.

This is not fair, for the Linga 'placed in the cavity of the heart' being equivocal yield to other interpretations and hence is refuted by both of them. Take for instance your supposition that Agni Sukta is Vishnu Sukta. No doubt, as mentioned in the Sutra अग्निव्यवहारेः आहमरथ्यः (1-2-29) the rule can still arrange to make a distinction like 'this is Agni Sukta' 'this is Vayu Sukta'. But still it cannot explain the popular convention—'This is Agni Sukta and not Vishnu Sukta'. Therefore Sukta is Niravakesha or exclusive or unequivocal and does not yield to another naming. So the Purvapaksha now stands unassailable.

The Sidhanta calmly yet steadily begins its work of counter attack. The Shruti विमेकर्णा पत्यतः shows the un

limited richness of attributes like कर्णादिविदूरत्व 'inaccessibility to ears'; and the Shruti परोमाज्ञया asserts that this unlimitedly rich attribute crowns Vishnu exclusively. Jyoti in the form of 'effulgence' is an inherent quality of Vishnu; And if found with others, is under his control. तद्वाज्योतिषां ज्योतिः confirms this usage of Jyoti. Besides the Sutra (I-4-14) proves that this effulgence is purely a Vishnu Light. The charge that popular convention that AgniSukta is VishnuSukta cannot be explained, is based on general ignorance; And the exclusive Linga successfully repudiates both of them that are equivocal. Both by the mode of convention and derivation the word Jyoti expresses Vishnu alone and hence the Sukta is VishnuSukta. The purpose or fulfilment is clear that 'He who knows the one placed in the cavity of the heart through being placed in the heart, had raised an objection against Vishnu being Anandamaya and now that objection is explained.

o

o

o

TATTVAMANJARI

Even then there is no justification for calling Purnananda as Vishnu. For in the Shruti योवेदनिहितंयां Anandamaya is said to be placed in the cavity of the heart, In ज्योतिर्हृदयमाहितं, some Jyoti or Light is said to possess this attribution of 'being placed in the heart.' And this Jyoti again is found associated with Agni in the Agni Sukta त्वामग्ने; and hence refers to Agni. Now it is not reasonable to conceive Agni, called by the name Jyoti and Vishnu called by the name of Anandamaya as residing in the cavity of the heart as independent promptors of all. Therefore it is said ॐ ज्योतिस्वरणामिधानात्.

Its meaning is that by all words in all Suktas like Jyoti; which mean other things, Vishnu alone is called and not Agni and others; Because सर्वगुणस्वतः Vishnu alone possesses all those qualities which constitute his unlimited wealth in the form of his inaccessibility to ears, eyes and mind. For what reason? The answer is सर्वगुणस्वतः. In the commentary on the fifth Chapter of Geeta it is said स्वयं ज्योतिष्ठात् भगवतः. This means that the word Jyots signifying Prakasha or Light has its cause of application which is amply found in Vishnu and over which when found with others Vishnu has undisputed authority.

o

o

o

PRAKASHA

Here an important difference of opinion regarding the arrangement of Adhikarana has been noticed for review. Raghavendra introduces this discussion by reminding the statement of Chandrikakar at the beginning that what is ambiguous in the Teeka (is made clear). So he explains the difference in the arguments of the Adhikarana mentioned by the Teekakara, with a view to devotail the differences of opinion. For this purpose Chandrikakara mentions the different views.

There are three theories (which are all acceptable). The first theory of Adhikarana arrangement is that the Adhikarana consists of four Sutras beginning with Jyoti (Chandobhidhant, Bhutadipada and UpadeshaBheda). The Vishya Vakya (Topical sentence) taken from AgniSukta (ज्योतिर्हृदय अहितं). Tattvapradeepa opens that ज्योतिः चयनाग्निमानात् has first topical sentence, the sentence from Agni

Sukta and is one Adhikarana. While a different view is that the four Sutras constitute one Adhikarana; but the topical sentence even for Jyoti Sutra is a sentence from Chandogya अमयदतः परोदिवोज्योतिः Sannyaya Ratnavalikara thinks that the commentary of the Sutra of छन्दोभिधानात् is the Anuvya-khyena "नित्यत्वादेवराहानाम्" and it elucidates the Adhikarana ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात् so as to ascertain its purport. Thus it cites the topical sentence from Chandogya while the different view is that Jyoti Sutra is one Adhikarana and the Chanda and two others make up different Adhikarana. This is the opinion of the Tarkakara.

These are the different arrangements and interpretations of Adhikaranas. Now the view of Tattvapradeepa kara is taken for review. It is objected that the same Agni sukta is the topical sentence in all the four sutras, there is no छन्दोभिधान, no भूतादिपादव्यपदेश, no उपदेशमेद, mentioned in the Agnisukta. For गायत्रीवाङ्मन्त्रं and others are found only in छन्दोग्यब्राह्मण and if this is not referred to in छन्दोभिधानात् and other Sutras then there is no connection between Vishaya Vakya and the Sutruas.

But this is not a sound objection, For in Agnisukta there is reference to ज्योतिर्हृदयमाहितं and in chandogya also there is अमयदतः परोदिवोज्योतिः reference to ज्योतिः and to हृदयमाहितत्वं in योयमन्तहृदय In a different Shekha also, if the same word occurs you may take it to be one and the same according to शारदांतराधिकरण न्यायः.

This Nyaya is explained in Jaimini Sutra. (II-2-9) The aems Agnihotra Jyotistoma and others are enjoined in

different Suktas like Kathaka, Kanva, Madhyandina and others. Now this Agnihotra Jyotistatma is not different but one and the same, like the one enjoined on different persons; by the rule that the same फल or (motive) accrues to one and all. So just as Agnihotra Jyotistatma though occurring in different Shakhas is one and the same, so also Jyoti occurring in different Vedas is one and the same as it is one word and one property.

Now this oneness or sameness of Jyoti both in Agni Sukta and Chandogya must be accepted. Otherwise even in the arrangement of different Adhikaranas according to Teekakara, there would be no reason for Gayatri to be छंदस् or metre in AgniSukta though there is reason for it in छंदोग्य, गायत्रिवाङ्मन्त्रः. Hence the posterior Adhikarana cannot raise its Purvapaksha as an objection to what is said in the prior Adhikarana.

But when the identity of Jyoti is accepted then the Sutra छंदोभिदानत् means "Jyoti in AgniSukta means not Vishnu; For this Jyoti in Chandogya means Gayatree."

But this is not fair. For in such a Purvapaksha it is argued that Jyoti in Agnisukta is not Vishnu; because there is another Shruti where Jyoti connotes by convention differently. Thus you can have a Purva Paksha in your own context well argued, Therefore it is not necessary to prove the oneness of Jyoti in AgniSukta and छंदोग्य. Take JyotiShruti either as belonging to the group of names of gods or of names of physical elements; according to the former rule of interpretation the word Jyoti has also the feasibility of referring to Vishnu; it is not exclusive mark of Vishnu and hence more powerful. Therefore that is not

the only way of raising an argument. Thus also you need not confute. For according to Bhashya the Purvapaksha is powerful for it is favoured by context which is unequivocal in the form of particular Sukta (Agnisukta).

We are going to dialate upon it in the immediate future. Till then we wish to state that what is argued is not reasonable. For we want to prove the word (Jyoti) in the different context also, to mean Vishnu; hence without brushing aside those that signify it, we gather from the different contexts all those that signify Vishnu. But before that with a view to raise an objection to the meaning of Vishnu of such words (Jyoti) in all places we have called forth those that signify in different places. But you should not suppose thereby that we instance always the sentence from Chandogya and having proved that Jyoti there, means Vishnu, we prove the Jyoti in Agni Sukta also means Vishnu both being identical. For even in this view under Sidhanta argument, we shall have to take recourse to a round about way. For we shall have to state that in Agni-sukta Jyoti is said to be associated with (चरणविश्रानात्) straying away of ears and eyes, therefore Jyoti in Chandogya also is Vishnu.

But again in this Paksha there is brevity, For only in Sidhanta to state a single argument in the form of straying away of ears and eyes, one Sutra shall have to be taken recourse to in order to find out other contexts. While in the view of Tattvapradeepa there is a lengthy process in adding a number of arguments both in Purvapaksha and Sidhanta and for this many other contexts should be found out and three other Sutras should be cited.

This is not the right way of ascertaining whether the process is lengthy or brief. When in both the cases the finding of other contexts is common the nature of arguments whether one or many is immaterial. Besides it is more proper to have a search of other contexts in the unimportant Sutras than in the important ones. The purport of it is that if Jyoti is Vishnu on account of the straying away of ears and eyes (This is stated in the first Sutra) and when with the help of (प्राप्तक) signifiers from other contexts the objection raised previously only rises afterwards. Therefore Tattvapra. deepa says — "But the Acharya who is a great apostle of the Vedas, the Samanvaya of the whole Veda is as good as discussed by considering the meaning of the Mantra with the instance of AgniSukta".

You treat the other Sutras also like भूतादिपादव्यपदेशात् in the same manner. Raghavendra explains this implicit statement. Jyoti in Agnisukta is Vishnu only. For in Chandogya this very Jyoti is said to have भूतादिपाद. For one is Gayatree and another is Jyoti and their properties also (one is द्युस्थित्व and other is दियःपरत्वं). But inspite of this difference there is canformity between them (अविरोधात्). Thus the Sutras must be interpreted.

But in Purva Paksha, Agni Sukta treats of Agni while Chandogya treats of Chandas; hence one cannot be recognised as another. Yet this doubt is baseless. For in the Shruti तेजोदेवब्रह्मवचंसं गायत्री we find गायत्री is used in apposition to तेजः which is not very different from Agni. This fact reveals the possibility of Agni being used in the place of Gayatree and Gayatree being used in the place of Agni. Thus

there is also the possibility of chandogya like Agnisukta treating Agni; and of Agni Sukta like chandogya treating Gayatree. Hence we conclude that both the words have the same meaning.

But in spite of this conclusive similarity or unity of subject matter between chandagya and Agnisukta there seems to be some Keen difference amounting to contrariety. For in Agnisukta the one treated is inaccessible to eyes and ears (विमेरुणित्तयंतः) while that in Chandogya is said to be accessible to eyes and ears (तददृष्टं च श्रुतं). But this contrariety can be reconciled by stating that the object described in one is अदृष्ट because wholly it cannot be seen (कस्मैः); yet partly it can be seen (एकदेशेन). Or the subtle form cannot be seen while the gross can be seen. Therefore the second alternative also is flawless.

Thus the other alternatives also are critically reviewed and shown not so much different, one from the other. Then he shows that different Topical statements do not constitute a criterion for a different Adhikarana, when the rule of operation is the same. What really constitutes an Adhikarana is explained in detail in samanvaya Sutra. Materials and gods form the essence of a yaga. As the essential form is not known, these two cannot be enjoined in a sacrifice. This is well illustrated by instances from Jaimini Sutras.

The two Statements in the Sutra आधारान्निहोत्रमरुणवाद् are आधारमावापयति and अग्निहोत्रजुहोति. Do these statements simply repeat what have been already enjoined as preces of rituals or do they enjoin new sacrificial ceremonies ?

In the first instance the two Statements given are quite different yet there is one common point. Both these are not yagas enjoined as there is absence of the essential form of yaga viz the materials and deities. This is the Purvapaksha argument of both. And there is the common point in the Sidhanti argument also-viz the descriptions in the Mantras or hymns, supply us materials and deities. And hence it cannot be argued that there is absence of essential form of yaga.

In both Agni Sukta and Chandogya Mantra though Jyoti alone is the topic and hence Jyoti alone is referred to in Jyoti Sutra yet in chanda Sutra mere places and Chandas cannot justly be mentioned. For in both the Sutras chandas alone is not the Purvapaksha view. But in Agnisukta it is Agni and in chandogya it is Chandas

The proper rejoinder to this objection is that the word Chandas in Chandas Sutra implies Agni also.

Even then some how in the first two sutras some common point may be found in both the statements, yet in the last two sutras no common point can be found as भूतानिदव्यपदेश cannot be traced in the sukta. We do admit that the argument of the sidhanta (भूतादिवाद) is not to be found only in chandogya vakya of this Adhikarana, just as तद्धेतुव्यपदेश is not to be found in Ananda mayadhi karana. only in Anandamaya Sutra.

Now Raghavendra imposes upon himself the task of explaining the Meemansaka corroboration produced by Chandrikakara.

Enjoinment or Vidhi or Arthavada (Praise or blame) is referred to in the Sutra आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वात् आनर्थक्यमतदर्शनां The Veda issues injunctions enjoining activity; hence those Arthavadas indulging in eulogistic praise or deprecatory blame do not serve the purpose of producing activity. So they are not valid. This is the Purva Paksha view. But the sidhanta is that (विधिनात्वेकवाक्यत्वात्तत्तुल्यार्थत्वेन विधीनांस्तुः) in this Sidhanta sutra the word तु or another Sutra तुल्यं संप्रदायिकं it is stated that the whole of the study of the Vedas ending in the realisation of the great objectives of life, do take the help of Arthavadas (words of praise or blame) while enjoining this sort of study; and hence Arthavadas are valid. This is one layer of discussion. While in the other layer the Purva Paksha is that the Arthavedas being no medium are not valid. But the Sidhanta Sutra accepts praise and hence Arthavadas are the medium and are valid. The first layer is the common layer and this second one is the uncommon layer. Just as there are two layers of discussion in the Meemansa Sutras, so also here there are two layers of discussion.

In the one layer in both the statements the word Jyoti means Vishnu or some one else. This is the doubt Agni is said to be chandas and the unknown Jyoti is used with Gayatri hence it serves no purpose Jyoti is not Vishnu; but some one else. This is Purva Paksha. To this the reply of the Sidhanti is that in both the cases is mentioned unlimited wealth connoted by the word charana. An unknown word is used for the purpose of meditative worship. Hence Jyoti is Vishnu. This is one layer of thought. Again in another layer of thought the Jyoti in chandogya is not Brahma or

Vishnu; but different one on account of a different statement. This is Purvapaksha. But Sidhanti expressed his view depending upon भूतादिषादव्यपदेशेन. This is the second layer of thought. Thus here also there is one common and another uncommon discussion.

Raghavendra discusses many more objections, And at last comes to the conclusion that there is this difference of opinion regarding the arrangement and interpretation of the Sutras. But this difference does not affect the doctrines of Dwaita Sidhanta. Hence there is no doctrinal difference between the three views of interpretations. This is of use in solving difference of opinion in other places also.

Here again Raghavendra raises an objection against the connecting link. Teekakara in Tattvaparakashika, of course has offered connecting link which includes this Adhikarana in Shastra and Adhyaya. But he has not supplied us hints to subsume this, in the Pada. On the other hand the word Jyoti might mean an element (भूत) or according to the Nyaya of Akashadhikarana it might mean some god or according to the nyaya of Antaradhikarana it might mean Vishnu. Hence it becomes quite clear that Jyoti means both Vishnu and other things. (उभयत्रसिद्ध) and its Samanvaya cannot be sought here in this pada devoted to the Samanvaya of words that signify otherthings than Vishnu. Why? just as Prana at the end of the Pada in Pranadhikarana gets its Samanvaya though it has already been proved; only because Prana is अन्यत्रसिद्ध depending upon the Parlance of the public, so

also the samanvaya of Jyoti can be sought, But both the cases just referred to are not Similar. Because in Pranadhi Karana an objection has been raised as PurvaPaksha on the Samanvaya of Prana sought earlier. So its treatment in Pranadhikarana is justified, while here no such objection has been raised and hence no such Samanvaya can be sought.

Thus meandering the discussion goes on. At the last stage again an objection is raised. If Jyoti is other than Vishnu; then one placed in the cave is also the other. Then 'one dwelling inside' (stated before) also is that other one. Thus Antaradhikarana also may as well be objected. Hence by raising the previous objection there is no scope for the doubt of उभयत्रप्रसिद्ध.

A counter objection is raised to the effect that 'placed in the cave' is different. But this does not stand; for the same dwelling inside is said to be निहितगूहासु placed in the cave; and Jyoti also is placed in the cave and is sung thus in the Mantras. Anadamaya is also sung in Mantras. Thus Anandamaya also is Jyoti. Thus this objection is stright forward.

But this is not fair. first objection was raised against Anandamaya Adhikarana and here also the something must be done. And the objection that is held up may similarly be treated. The objection against the Antarnaya-dhikarana should reach Anandamayadhikarana to raise an objection against it. Otherwise there would be no objection raised against Jijnasadhikarana.

But upon this, one should not argue that because it is stated to be imprceptible which amounts to अदृश्यत्व

and hence Anandamaya also is Jyoti. For it is fair to contend like that. But this is not fair when we compare the two; objection through अदृश्यत्व is obtained from many sources; while objection through गृहास्थत्व which is near is obtained from one sentence only.

So long, doubts were entertained that were based on evidences. Now doubts based on the object of knowledge itself is taken for consideration. The cause of application of the word Jyoti is 'antagonism to darkness', it is to be found every where. So it cannot be applied to Brahman who is concurrent with darkness.

No doubt in the Agnisukta it is stated वैश्वानरः जायमानः and thus there is वैश्वानरश्रुति and जायमानत्वलिङ्ग (mark of being born), still it is clearly stated in Dyubhavadhikarana that Shruti has scope of applicability to Vishnu, while Linga also has scope of applicability to Vishnu, therefore Purvapekha is not based on both of them in both Bhashaya and Teeka.

Now follows the S dhanta. Impeceptible to the ear and to other senses is found only in Vishnu and not any where else. But this imperceptibility is not absolute, but it is only relative. It only suggests wealth, unlimited in nature, and not absolute; but it is only relative. It only suggests wealth, unlimited in nature and not absolute imperceptibility. For it is an impossibility every where.

It is an indisputable fact that Shruti has scope of applicability else where, yet it is chosen here as an instance or in the case of doubt based on the object of knowledge, assuming pride that Shruti has no scope else where, and

hence it is cited here. For instance Jyoti in Agni Sukta is Vishnu only and not Agni. For there is the mark in the form of imperceptibility to the ears by the use of the word Charana you need not object that mark is made null and void by the joint efforts of Shruti and Linga. For Linga is unequivocal. This is first. The Second is -Jyoti is Vishnu only. For there is unequivocal mark. You should not suppose that this unequivocal mark is proved false by Shruti favoured by the hymn devoted to Agni. For these two have easy applicability to Vishnu.

Again a doubt is raised that 'imperceptibility to the ears and others' means inaccessibility to ears and mind. This does not suit Brahman because Brahman is apprehended by the mutation of the mind (मनोवृत्ति). Hence it is said as stated above that imperceptibility is to be found only in Vishnu, in the sense of abundance of wealth.

But the teachers of Veda teach us that this is not Vishnu Sukta; (but it is Agni Skuta). This objection also is refuted. This publicity of Agni Sukta of not being Vishnu Sukta is due to layman's (ignorance, and it is illustrated by a meemansa example. there is a Satra lasting for 26 years and is called Ayana. This yaga requires meat for its oblation. Then a mantra- वायमसिधिर्नुहि देवान् is used to pound rice on the stone. It is doubted whether this mantra is to be guessed or not. Now वाय or corn is some thing having husk on it and hence it has no power of connotating rice. Hence it cannot imply this mantra by guess, just as in Saura yaga the word Savitra in the Mantra देवस्यत्वा cannot guess. To This objection the reply is that implication of effect by the mention of cause is brought into operation

Hence (धान्य) or corn Signifies 'Rice'. For this is already involved in the cause (धान्य). Hence this mantra धान्यमसि चिनुहिदेवान् might be guessed. This is the Sidhanta.

That Laskhana or implication used in respect of the cause is Secondary is not usually meant and in voluntary statement implication need not be taken recourse to; Hence मृगोसि cannot be used implying मांस. If yojnikas accept such implication it is due to their ignorance; so also immature publicity that there is no word like Vishnu (in Agnisukta) is due to ignorance.

The same analogy holds good in the case of other Suktas. Many of these have the mark of Brahma. And these marks, being exclusive, contradict Shruti and Prakarana that have scope else where, In the case of some suktas as they cannot reasonably signify other things, they connote Vishnu only.

But if the clear marks of Brahma are interpreted to mean eulogistic praise of the various gods like Indra and Agni there even in Akasha and Prana Adhikaranas also the Brahmic marks might be utilised for the eulogy of Akasha and Prana and those Adhikaranas might not have been begun at all. So this theory of Praise does not stand at all. Besides an unreal thing is not suitable to be worshipped.

But it is objected that as Indra and other gods among them selves and with Brahman are identical the use of Brahma Mark is compatible with the use of words like fire and others. And hence 'त्वमग्न इन्द्रोवृषभ' (you are Agni Indra) is also a reasonable use. This objection is easily rejoined. For identity between qualified goods is contra-

dicted. But if it is meant the identity of mere substantive (without any adjective to qualify) the mode of interpretation would be not primary but secondary. The same analogy can be extended to Akasha and others. यस्मिन् आहुः clearly states difference in the Antaradhikarana; and hence runs counter to the former. Because the word वृथक् clearly means 'different' or separate, which contradicts identity.

You should not contend that Marks again can be restricted to connote the controller of its subordinate, for there is no opposition. In the same manner Pavaka and other words should not be argued to convey Surya through derivation without contradiction. Yet convention is stronger than derivation. In other Sutras also these suggestions lead you easily out of self-contradiction.

But here if the Shruti favoured by the hymn, is set aside by a mere exclusive mark, then the Indra Shruti and Akasha Shruti not being favoured by the hymn are more easily set aside and hence the former argument is futile. This objection is explained that this argument is based on the argument of the Antaradhikarana. Hence no question of futility arises. It must be clearly noted that though strong having applicability else where is contradicted by a weak yet having no other applicability. This is inter Adhikarana argument and without the help of this argument conclusion cannot be arrived at.

Even then this argument is a repetition of an argument in Jyotirdarshana. For there also Jyoti in Agnisukta was objected to be Vishnu and then the objection was removed. Keeping all these things in mind and the statement in chandrika, Raghavendra introduces the real tenor of the

argument. No doubt there it is the Jyoti not in the Agnisukta but in the Vajasaneya. Yet it must be construed in the following manner. Jyoti in Agnisukta is not Vishnu; for this Jyoti in Vajasaneya is heard to be mortal. There in Vajasaneya the Jyoti is associated with many marks of Jeeva; hence there Jyoti is Jeeva and in Agnisukta also it is so. This is the Purvapaksha view. Now the Sidhanta is that Jyoti is introduced in discussion about Atma and ends with its self-luminosity. The discussion about Atma has some clear spots characterised by unequivocal statements about Vishnu and it is but incumbent upon us to interpret the marks of Jeeva as applying to Brahma. Therefore the Jyoti in Agnisukta also should be understood in that light. This is the Sidhanta. Thus here there is no rule of exclusive mark contradicting equivocal evidences. Nor the method of removing the additional doubt in the sukta, so there is no question of repetition.

Thus doubt based on evidence is removed by stating that there is a clear and exclusive mark. Now doubt based on Prameya (object of Valid knowledge) is also explained away stating that Jyoti is self luminous, by basing the explanation on etymological derivation

Therefore this is Vishnu only.

CHANDOBIDIDHANADHIKARANAM

छंदोभिधानात्नेति चेन्न तथा चेतोर्वर्णनिगदात् तथा हि दर्शनम्

SUTRA :

The word Gayatree in chandoga Shruti states a metre (छंदस्) of 24 syllables; hence the one conveyed by Gayatree is not Vishnu. But this is not right. For there is a darshana

or Shruti which interprets Gayatree (गायति त्रायतिच) to be Vishnu; for he sings and protects. And this attribute of singing and protecting of Vishnu appeals to the heart at the time of meditation.

BHASHYA :

In Chandogya 'अथ यदतः परोज्योतिः दीप्यते (Then the three forms in swetadweep and others are higher than the heaven. That Light is refulgent.) The Jyoti mentioned here is said to be Gayatree (गायत्रीवा इदं सर्वं) and not Vishnu. If thus objected it is rejoined that it is not correct. The word Jyoti conveys Vishnu only. The use of the word Jyoti in the sense of Vishnu is to show that words like Agni and Gayatree also are used in the sense of Vishnu for the sake of worshipful meditation. Accordingly Gayatree is derived in the Shruti, 'he sings and protects'.

Therefore it is stated in Vamana Purana that Vishnu is called by all the names of metres like Gayatree; and by all the names of gods (like Agni); He is also called by all the names of worlds like (Prithvee). But they are the names of those respective things formally.

Sutr—भूतादिपादन्यपदेशोपपत्तेरैवम्

That Brahma is called by the name of Gayatree and others is the only correct statement. Because what is stated

in पादोऽस्य सर्वाभूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि as Bhutas and Amrita forming its parts becomes applicable only to Vishnu, and not to others.

BHASHYA

“His prowess is so great; but the Purusha is still greater than that. All worlds form one part of him and his other immortal three parts are in heaven.” (Cha. 3-12-6) “The golden Kosha of Brahmanda covered over with dust, is the body of Brahma and the treasure house of gods. It is full of released souls; It is said to be a pada limited to a part of Vishnu who offers six senses in the objects of pleasures. (तै आ 3-11). Shruti runs thus and Pada is a part of some thing which is different as in the instance that “one is a fourth part in strength of another.” He is propounded in Purusha Sukta.

‘यज्ञेन यज्ञमयजंत’ (तै. आ 3-12) (Gods worshipped Vishnu (यज्ञं) with sacrifice यज्ञेन, by the use of the word yajna (in reference to him). For in an other shruti it is stated that (यज्ञो विष्णुर्देवता) yajna is God Vishnu.

In Skanda Purana it is stated— “At that time all men were called by the name of Rama, just as in Purusha Sukta Vishnu alone is propounded.”

SUTRA

उपदेश भेदात्तत्वेन्नोभयस्मिन्नन्वविरोधात् The two different Shruties, stating Gayatree to have been placed in ज्यु and Jyoti to have been placed above ज्यु declare different characteristics amounting to conflict of Shruties; and hence they cannot be the same Vishnu; but they must be different. This objection is met with the rejoinder that it is not so. For there is no contradiction even if one and the same is stated in both the Shruties.

It is formerly stated that 'त्रिपादस्यामृतं द्विवि' (cha 3-12-6) 'परोदिवः' (cha 3-13-7) is stated after wards with दिव् in the ablative Therefore both cannot be one and the same. This objection is flatly denied, basing their rejoinder on the theory of three worlds and of seven worlds.

Thus ends Chandobhidhanadhi Karanam.

BHAVADEEPA

With very strong reasons the Purva Paksha presents its view that Gayatree cannot be Vishnu. Hence Jyoti also which is said to be Gayatree is not Vishnu. But Jyoti Shruti has been proved to be referring to Vishnu. Hence Purvapaksba is not sound in its conclusion. But one thing is to be taken in to consideration. Jyoti Shruti permits another interpretation; while Gayatri Shruti does not permit another interpretation. It exclusively means 'a metre' and not Vishnu.

Now Gayatree has a derivative meaning which is secondary. गायति त्रायति च गानत्राण कर्तृत्वं, 'a Singer and a protector.. But the cause of the usage of the word constitutes the nature of Gayatree depending upon Vishnu. But Gayatree.

is eternal and it must be also begingless. Therefore it does not depend upon God's will as in the case of Akasha which is Janya or created,

Hence Gayatree is of the nature of word and on the the strength of Shruti that is exclusive in application based on convention, leads other marks of Vishnu also to apply to it, therefore Gayatree is not Vishnu. -

Now Raghavendra adduces reasons comprehensively for adopting the Purvapaksha view, that Gayatree is some metre and not Vishnu. For 1) Gayatree conventionally connotes a metre 2) and there is a statement to that effect; 3) Jyoti Shruti can adjust itself to the meaning of Gayatree. 4) And Gayatree cannot condescend to connote Vishnu; 5) The cause of applicability of Gayatree does not depend upon the disposal of God, 6) nor does that inhere in God all these reasons are actively incorporated in this statement. Therefore Gayatree is not Vishnu but a छंदस् or metre. Therefore Jyoti and Anandamaya also are not Vishnu

Teekakara uses the word अनुकरोति and Raghavendra defines what is अनुकरण यथान्यासस्यहिपुनरुच्चारणं अनुरक्षणं Repeating what is written down or spoken. is imitation or अनुकरण. He also defines what is भाष्य,सूत्रार्थोवर्ण्यते यत्र पदैः सूत्रानुकारिभिः । स्वपदानिचवर्ण्यते भाष्यं भाष्यविदोविदुः ॥ Bhashya or commentary is that in which the Sutras interpreted in words as used in the sutras and the words of the commentator also are explained, according to those well versed in Bhashya.

In the foregone Adhikaranas and in the coming Adhikaranas, in the sentences chosen as topics. (for discussion)

widely known words like Vishnu and Narayana are not used but words like Indra, Akasha, Agni, Jyoti, Prana and others are used, with a view that one must be able to meditate upon Vishnu as endowed with special virtues gathered from the derived meaning of these names, so that these are attributed to Him as a token of his unlimited wealth of Virtues.

Smriti fully supports the view that Vishnu is Gayatree as per derivation of the word. As the Vedas flow out from his mouth he can be very well called the singer (गायति) of the Vedas And he protects (त्रायति) all. "Therefore Vasudeva the great Purusha is Gayatree."

Now this Gayatree is said to be identical with पृथिवी (यावं सागायत्री.....इयंपृथ्वी) and is said to be the support of all and superior to all. All This holds good only when Gayatree is Vishnu and not otherwise. This also suggests that the meaning of Prithivee agrees with Vishnu on account of the clear marks of Vishnu, she possesses Hence the identity with Prithivee is injurious to the Purvapaksha and not to Sidhanta.

One question is when two instruments like Shruti and Linga contradict each other how to settle the meaning? Raghavendra gives us a hint; when both of them seem to be of doubtful Veracity we must find if one of them emerges to be of genuine Veracity. That proves to be stronger of the two. Here there was another course open to them. One that has abundance of occurrence (गङ्गुह्य) is stronger than the one that has scanty occurrence. Thus Linga being cited in many places decides the question. But

here abundance of occurrence of Linga is not shown to be the strong Virtue in Linga; but its exclusive application to Vishnu is chosen as the strong point to over ride the claim of Shruti. For this device achieves another objective. A mark not applicable to any other but to Vishnu proves conclusively exclusive reference to him. Hence Niravakasha Linga and not Linga-bahulya was chosen as the instrument to prove that Gayatree is Vishnu. Other evidences are there to add strength to this instrument.

Here Gayatree, being a part of Veda which is eternal and beginningless, was said to be eternal and beginningless. Now we must have a clear concept of eternity and beginninglessness of the Vedas. Both these terms are used in a restricted sense. It is absence of varied and various sequence of words as in the Puranas. For Smrithi declares Veda to have no other reading. In Tatvanirnaya it is said that God being all-knowing, is conscious of veda in his mind at all times. Depending upon this eternity of the vedas in the mind of God, Vedas were said to be eternal in Tattva-sankhyana. And in its commentary eternity is explained as "unchanging having no beginning and no end." But in the commentary of Tattvanirnaya it is clearly stated that he does not contend eternity to be unchangeableness. For sequence is changing in nature. Veda also consists of letters, that are pervading and eternal, modified by sequence depending upon pronounciation. Therefore Vedas cannot claim eternity and beginninglessness of primary nature, as that of the letters.

भूतादिपादव्यपदेशोपपत्तैवम्.

Teekacharya in Tattvprakashika uses the form समर्थयत् the present participle of अर्थ् with सम् (अर्थ्वाञ्चायां). This root

is used in Atmanepada and 10th conjugation. And hence it ought to have been समर्थयमान. But by चक्षिञ् व्यक्तायांवाचि this root becomes अनुदात्त and it must be conjugated in Atmanepada. In the mean while with an अनुदात्तङित makes the imposition of Atmanepada irregular. Besides Kalidasa in Raghuvansha uses “प्रार्थयति शयनोत्थितप्रियाः. Hence समर्थयत् is quite regular grammatically. There is another reading साधयत् which does not create any such trouble.

Gayatree is said to be of six kinds which have been already mentioned. १) एवं सर्वं भूतं Gayatree is all beings. २) वाग्वंगायत्री Gayatree is indeed speech. ३) येयंपृथिवी Gayatree is Prithivi ४) यदिदं अस्मिन् शरीरं This is the body ५) यदिदं अस्मिन् हृदयं This is the heart. Thus along with Gayatree these five form the group of six. This clearly shows that Gayatree of six variety has, as mentioned in Shruti, four feet and not, as understood by others Gayatree has four feet consisting of भूत, पृथिवी, शरीर and हृदय.

Now hints as to how to construe the Sutra are given. the last word एवं as found in the context of the Sutra Supplies the Pratijna of the Sutra that Gayatree is Vishnu. Yet it is also construed with भूतादिषादव्ययदेवात् Raghavendra makes the point clear. एवं means ‘according to the Mantra’ तावानस्य महिमा, as भूतादिषाद has been mentioned एवं Gayatree may be Vishnu’.

There is the question and explanation, about three. Of these three the most important has been mentioned. To show this and to show the way of explanation that it is different from the way accepted by others (एवं is used). उपदेश मेदात्.

The three worlds referred to in Bhashya are Anantaśana, Vaikuntha and Narayanapura. The seven words are Bhus, Bhuvās, suvās, Janas, Tapas and Satyam.

There are two statements in one of which त्रिपादस्यामृतं (दिवि). दिव् in Locative used in another (परः दिवः) दिव् in the ablative is used. Both refer to one and the same Vishnu. Because खेतदीप, अनंतासन and वंकुठ are said to be दिव् and the three forms of Vishnu in those three worlds are said to be in दिव्. When seven worlds are taken Indrasadana is called Diva and the world above it is Vaikuntha and it is and it is Divapara. And the three forms in that Loka are Divahpara.

Gayatree by derivation and convention refer to Vishnu. Gayatree stands for all Vedic words (meaning metre) like उष्णिग्, बृहन्, अनुष्टुप्. So the thesis at the beginning is Gayatree and all such words in the Veda refer to Vishnu. In the Sutra the word Gayatree is not verbally mentioned. (छंदस् is used.) This Gayatree though feminine in gender means Vishnu as it will be explained in Prakṛtyadhikarāṇa. Now Gayatree is said to be Jyoti and there is no opposition between 'Standing in Diva' and 'standing above Diva'. And finally he is the same Anandamaya.

Some Ramanujeeya raises an objection that Chandus Sutra need not form a separate Adhikarāṇa. For in this Sutra there is the word चेत् which indicates some objection against the previous Sutra (hence shows continuity with the previous Sutra); this is not fair because he himself has formed a separate Adhikarāṇa with भोक्त्यापत्तेः अविभागाच्चेत् though there is चेत् used in it.

Again in this Sutra (तथाहिदर्शनं) तथा means only 'similar to Chandas' and not Gayatree. It is shown that this is not right in Chandrika.

Ramanujeeya's criticism of Readings is not sound. For instance they say that निगदात् is a bad reading and prefer निगमात् as a better reading. For this preference is baseless. And his finding fault with dissolution of the compound as चेतोर्पणयनिगदः is not to the point. For it is said that no cause and effect are involved here. (as in यूपायदाह) But in MahaBhasya itself in Paspasha part घर्मनियम is used and is it dissolved as घर्मयनियमः which involves no cause and effect.

Again तथाहिदर्शनम् is interpreted as showing a mark (Linga) of Vishnu. To this Ramanujeeya objects For had it been so the Sutrakara would have said only लिगात्. But this again is a hasty conclusion. For as stated in अनुभाष्य and Sudha, Shruti and Linga get strength by multiplicity, and accordingly many sentences are chosen where the word Brahma is repeated and the word Gayatree is also derived and तथाहिदर्शनम् does this work. If merely लिगात् is used all this cannot be suggested.

Another objection based on Grammar is raised. If Gayatree is Vishnu then चतुष्पद referring to it is ungrammatical. For the Sutra is टावृचि which means ऋचिवाच्यायां पादंत त् ट पस्यात् at the end of a BahuVreehi compound पाद् becomes पदा when it qualifies ऋच्. Therefore it should not be चतुष्पदा, as it qualifies Vishnu Even this objection.

does not hold good. For on the Strength of multiplicity of Shruti and Linga once Gayatree is settled to be Vishnu, the qualifying adjective might be explained some how. पदोन्यत रस्यो enjoins डीप् optionally. When डीप् is not suffixed, टाप् is suffixed by the Sutra हर्लताद्वा and then there is पदा and चतुष्पदा stands justified by Grammar. Thus many more defects shown by him can be explained away.

NYAYA MUKTAVLI :

In contradiction to, or different from, what has been already said in Sidhanta, the Purvapaksha proceeds. This is the thought-link. In Chandogya in the third Chapter, Gayatree is mentioned— 'गायत्री वा इदं सर्वं भूतं यदिदं किंच वाग्वै गायत्री' and a doubt arises whether this Gayatree is a metre consisting of (fixed number of) syllables or Vishnu. The Purvapaksha is that it is a particular metre. For Gayatree is conventionally known to be a metre. You need not suspect that, as before, the marks of Vishnu would set at naught the declaration of Shruti. For there was no reason to use an unknown name like Gayatree in preference to a popularly known name of Vishnu. No doubt formerly one Jyoti Shruti was proved null and void by the popular Vishnu mark. But here there are many shruties like वाग्वै गायत्री and वेद्यं पृथिवी which cannot be brushed aside at one sweep. Besides Gayatree conventionally does not refer to Vishnu. And derivation is a weaker instrument of interpretation. For argument's sake, Gayatree is a part of Veda and claims eternity. An eternal thing is not subordinate to the will of God; and hence there is no scope for the

rule of Subordination to God. Now formerly Jyoti Shruti was decided to be referring to Vishnu; but on the strength of the latter Part of the sentence 'अययदतः परोदिकोज्योतिः दीप्यते' it is clearly disproved that Gayatree is Vishnu. It is not an easy thing to contradict a number of Shruties. It is stated तेजो वै ब्रह्मवर्चसं गायत्री) that Gayatree is Tejas which is a synonym of Jyoti. So Gayatree means Jyoti only. On the strength of this the former Jyoti also means Gayatree.

Or even conceding that the former Jyoti is Vishnu we cannot prove Gayatree to be Vishnu. For the former Jyoti is said to be in heaven (त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि) and the Jyoti that is said to be above दिव् is different from Gayatree. The former Jyoti which was beyond the senses of eyes and ears, might be Vishnu; but the Jyoti here (तदेद् दृष्यं श्रुतं च which is accessible both to eyes and ears is not Vishnu. Hence this Jyoti shruti cannot prove Gayatree to be Vishnu.

Now Sidhanta is that there are many Shruties and marks of Vishnu. 'ततो ज्यायांश्च पूरुषः' 'यद्वै तद्ब्रह्म' 'एतामेव ब्रह्मो पनिषः वेद' and many more are the shruties. His clear marks are the singer of the Vedas, and the protector of all, Bhuta and others constitute his part, and parcel; Supremacy over all-such Lingas are many. One is expected to meditate upon Vishnu with those attributes which are the causes of these and many more. Hence an unknown word has been used here. As many words and marks of Vishnu are used here. If we give up the sense of Vishnu we shall have to surrender the famous meanings of many words.

Shruti declares the meaning of Gayatree as 'गायति प्रायति' and this derivation of Shruti is more convincing than the convention of the ignorant. Besides beginningless attributes depend upon the substances in which they inhere. In the same manner, the eternal and ever lasting things like Prakriti, soul, and karma according to Shruti (स्वाभावजीव कर्मणियत्प्रसादादिमेसति, also depend upon God, So the rule of dependance upon God is applicable here. Besides by Mahayoga or great derivation (सर्वछंदोभिदोहोषः) and by Pauranika Rudhi, Gayatree is Vishnu. So the former and the latter Jyoti are both Vishnu. As for difference of state ments like staying in heaven (दिव्) and above heaven and of 'invisible and visible' can be reconciled referring to three and seven worlds and to the difference in form.

As for the final purpose the former Jyoti was objected to be Vishnu and then it was proved to be Vishnu; or through being the cause of sustenance (अस्यां हीदं सर्वं प्रतिष्ठितं). The Janmadhi-Sutra was objected and satisfactorily replied.

TARKADEEPIKA :

In this Adhikarana all names of metres like Gayatree in the Veda are shown to refer to Vishnu. Gayatree being the most important of the metres is mentioned as indicating other metres by implication.

In the Sutra the word छंदः must be repeated. In the Veda it is stated गायत्रीवा इदं सर्वं; and this Gayatree might be the name of the metre. For the word Gayatree connotes by convention (रुद्धि) a metre of that name; and not Brahma.

This is not a correct interpretation. Because Shruti is found stating to that effect. For the Shruti indicates the mark (गायति त्रायतिच) of 'doer of singing and protecting.' A reason for mentioning Brahma by an unknown word like Gayatree in the Sutra is given. That is stated so that one may meditate in the mind on Brahma as endowed with qualities like the agency of singing and protecting (गायत्रीवा इ सर्व) this clearly guides one in meditation. This is a hint to understand the significance of the mentioning of an unknown word even in other Adhikaranas.

In Sudha a bit different interpretation is offered. Jyoti in परोदिवोज्योतिः is a metre and not Vishnu. For at the beginning a metre Gayatree is named. This is the objection or Purvapaksha. And Sidhanta is that Gayatree is Brahma. For he is the singer and protector; and Jyoti also is Brahma.

Now again Gayatree is said to be Brahma भूतादिपादव्यप देशीपपत्तेर्द्वं because भूतं विश्वं आदिः यस्य अमृताख्य स्वरूपस्य तद्भूतादि भूतादिच असौ पादश्च तस्य व्यपदेशात्) the universe is mentioned as the Pada of the Amrita. पादोऽस्य सर्वाभूतानि त्रिपाद् अस्य णमृत दिवि-). एवं is to be construed twice. First एवं (त्रयाणामेवच एवं) means thus (as is the case of three only 'thus'). First Gayatree is said to consist of four Padas and in order to explain it Upanishad is cited. 'तावानस्यमहिमा' describes Purusha as having one Pada consisting of all Bhutas. The three forms called Amrita dwelling in the three worlds like वैकुण्ठ and others, are said to be त्रिपात् or three Padas. Thus Gayatree has four Padas like Bhuta and others.

This fact of having four such Padas does not file in with Gayatree as metre. That the end of the Sutra joins 'statement in Purusha Sukta' with this. The word Pada is primarily used in reference to Amrita which is the very essence of Brahma and secondarily used in the sense of Bhuta which is different from the essence of Bhrahma. This is illustrated by a grammatical instance **उपप्रथमयोरम्** enjoins **अम्** before **अस्मद्** and **युष्मद्** in **प्रथमयोः** i.e. in the nominative and Accusative cases. In **एकशेष** compound the principal word alone is detained. **प्रथमाथद्वितीया च प्रथमयोः**. Here also Amrita Pada is the Chief one Bhuta is the subordinate one

An objection is raised and clarification is offered in **उपदेश भदान्नेति चेन्नोभयस्मिन्नप्यविरोधात्**) Gayatree in the form of Jyoti is said to be both in heaven (**द्युस्थ**) and above heaven (**दिवःपरस्व**). Thus there are two different statements. They too both cannot be reasonably, one thing called Brahma. But this objection is not sound. For there is no antithesis between the two. Only they are based on different theories of three worlds and seven worlds; the three worlds are Bhus, Bhuvas, Swas. All worlds above the world Bhuvas are called 'द्यु' Hence forms of Narayana in swetadeep Anantasena and Vaikuntha are all in Heaven. (**द्युस्थ**). But when seven worlds like Bhus, Bhuvas; Swas, Mahas, Janas, Tapas and Satyam are taken, on the earth Mahameru is heaven, in the sky it is Suryamandala, and in Diva it is Indrasadana. Any world above these is above heaven. Hence Anantasana and others are above heaven. Even in the theory of three world, as explained above, Gayatree or Jyoti would be also staying above heaven. We want to

prove that Vaikuntha is above every kind of heaven; and hence we introduced the theory of seven worlds. For Vaikuntha is said to be the highest of all worlds.

In Chandrika another interpretation of the Sutra is given. Jyoties in Agnisukta and in Chandogya do not mean the same thing. Because one is said to be beyond the senses of ears while the other is said to be seen and heard. Thus there are different statements. This is the *prima facie* view. But the real meaning is that there is no inconsistency between the two statements. With the difference in the form both the statements might be adjusted.

TATTVAMANJARI

Jyoti in Agnisukta was called Vishnu. This very Jyoti in Chandogya in the third Adhayaya (अथयदतः परोदिवोज्यौतिः दिव्यते) is described as (दिवःपर) above heaven and the same is called Gayatree in गायत्रीवा इदं सर्वं. If that too is Gayatree then there is no purpose in classing Gayatree and Vak as words connoting other meanings than Vishnu. In तेजोवेब्रह्म चंसं गायत्री Gayatree is said to be तेसस् which is the synonym of Jyoti. Therefore the whole process of calling Jyoti as Vishnu is wrong. This is the Purvapaksha view.

The Sidhanta is propounded in three Sutras beginning with छंदोभिदानत्. The reply in Anubhashya is ज्योतिरित्याद्यैः. Now Jyoti in Agni-Sukta and Chandopanishad, and the word Gayatree which is associated with these, along with all words in Veda that are classed with Gayatree connote Vishnu only; and not any metre. Because (सर्वगुणत्वतः) all the qualities like 'Singing the Vedas' 'Protecting the

people' 'Supremacy over all' and 'having Bhutadi as his Pada', can be adjusted only in Vishnu, as declared in गायति श्रायतेच एतां एवनातिशययन्ते and पादोस्य सर्वाभूतानि. For सर्वगुणत्वतः Words meaning 'gods' like Gayatree and Vak get full significance to their causes of application only in Vishnu, who has full mastery over the causes of application inhering in others.

The words, popular as conveying other meanings than Vishnu, like Akasha and prana, connote Vishnu by the special primary mode; and this proves that all those qualities that also makes the point clear that there is purpose also in showing all words, not referring to Vishnu and yet referring to other objects, refer to Vishnu. These words which belong to the group of 'Adhidaiva, Adhibhuta. Adhyatma, those that occur in Suktas, and vedas, convey the secuse of Vishnu alone.

This reference to Vishnu by the highest mode of interpretation proves that Vishnu is full of attributes-which is the definition of Brahma as suggested by the derivation of Brahma.

It was stated that at the beginning by the word Gayatree and by the word Jyoti that comes after it, Vishnu alone is referred to. But Jyoti is said to be residing in heaven (द्युस्थत्व) and also said to be above heaven (दिवःपरत्व) Hence these two seem to be different. Still this doubt is baseless. Because (सर्वगुणत्वतः Vishnu alone can be both (द्युस्थ and दिवःपर) in and above heaven. With the theory of three worlds, the three heavens like Anantasana, swetat-weepa, and Vaikuntha are a hundred thousand yojanas

above Anatariksha. Hence the three forms of Vishnu like Vasudeva Narayan and Vaikunthe are found in heaven, And again in the स्मृति "पृथिव्यां द्यौः महामेरुः आकाशेसूर्यमंडलम्" दिवींद्रसदनंचैव तत्परेतुदिवःपरे" it is said that Mahameru is heaven on the Earth and in Akasha Surya-Mandala is heaven and in heaven Indrasadana is said to be heaven. Hence the three worlds like Anantasana and others are found above Mahameru and others respectively.

But even this explanation is not to the point. For in both the series it is not proved that Vaikuntha is higher than any world, (is the highest world). Then it is proposed that this comparison is to be instituted on the basis of seven world theory. Then it is easily proved that Vaikuntha is above heaven. And it is also proved that it is above all heavens. It is also proved that Jyoti in Agnisnkta also is Vishnu only, (सर्वगुणत्वतः He is also endowed with the peculiar and seemingly inconsistent qualities like 'beyond the reach of ears and eyes' and 'accessible to to ears and eyes'. For both can be reconciled through Adhithana.

(CHANDODHIKARANAM)

PRAKASHA :

Chandrikakara introduces this Adhikarana with the remark that the Adhikarana treats of words in veda like Gayatree and others. But this is not mentioned in Teeka. He has borrowed it from Nyayavivarana (अधिवेदगतानाम्). Those words are Gayatree, Rushnik, Brahatee and others like these.

Here in the Sutra any word having the attributive adjunct of Gayatree only cannot be reasonably mentioned. Hence Gayatree also is meant here. This is not right. For Gayatree is prominently mentioned here, being the mother giving second birth to the first three varnas; And others also are implied by it. Hence the common word chandas (or metre) is used to include all such others. Otherwise the sutrakara would have used Gayatree alone.

No doubt according to the way to be explained even words like Akasha and others also are to be cited. as they are to be treated here only in a different aspect. But Gayatree and other words are to be treated here in all aspects. Hence they are mentioned as instances.

What are the topical statements (विषय वाक्य) taken up for elucidation in this Adhikarana? Some say that 'अथयदतः परोदिवोज्योतिः' in chandogya is chosen for discussion. While others contend that 'गायत्रीवा इदं सर्वं' in chandogya is selected for discussion.

In the first opinion the doubt is entertained regarding Jyoti while in the second opinion it is regarding Gayatree. But what is all this fuss about? In the statement about Jyoti, Jyoti in the Agnisukta is disproved to be Agni; While Jyoti in Chandogya is disproved to be Chandas in the alternative of Jyotirvakya in both the opinions. In the alternative of Gayatree Vakya, in Jyoti of Agnisukta it is disproved that Jyoti is Agni and in Chandogya Gayatree is disproved to be a metre.

Then Chandrikakara enters into the labyrinth of alternatives and almost exhausts them till at last, a new

doubt is raised that the previous and the forth-coming Adhikaranas tend to object to the conclusions of Jijnasadhikarana based on the objections against Anandamaya. Then how can this Adhikarana peculiarly differing from these be included in this group? Hence another alternative is offered. To Jyoti that is stated in Chandogya, 'placed in the heart' which is the attribute of Anandamaya is announced to be the attribute. So without taking objection to the contents of Jyotiradhikarana, Anandamayadhikarana may be subjected to investigation.

Raghavendra here clarifies certain issues — This attribute 'placed in the heart' is stated in the Mantra 'योवेदनिहितं गुहायां' and not in Anandamaya. Still this 'placed in the heart' is said to be Anandamaya. Hence it is said that it is stated in Anandamaya.

Thus two alternatives were expressed in the theory of Jyotirvakya. Then in the theory of Gayatree Vakya also three more alternatives are offered and explained.

Then in the theory of GayatreeVakya the subject matter and the doubt are expressed. "गायत्रीवा इदं सर्वं" is fully quoted, till "य एवं वेदय एवं वेद" And after this "अथ यदतः परोदिवोज्योतिः दिप्यते" is quoted till "य एवं वेद य एवं वेद". Gayatree in this part of Veda is the subject matter.

Now the doubt is whether Gayatree is a matre (a collection of letters) or Vishnu. This is to be thought over. His Bhutadipada is nothing more than Ganatratna Kartritva (Singing of the Vedas and protecting the people) the etymological meaning of Gayatree. The question is whether Gayatree Shruti gets prominence over Mark (Linga) of shnu namely Bhutadipada or Vice versa. The letter also

is a plausible case; because the derivative meaning of Gayatree namely singing or interpreting of the Vedas does not agree with the meaning of Brahma. If Brahma is to be benefitted by this meaning then the meaning, its everlasting nature should be under the control of Brahma, or it should be inherent in Him. Now whether this attribute of Gayatree is under the control of Brahma or not is the question. If it is not subordinate to him then the cause of application is not to be found in Brahma. Hence the popularity is proved false and Gayatree is not Vishnu but a metre. Thus the object of PurvaPaksha is fulfilled. In Sidhanta it is just the opposite of this and hence it is not expressed.

It was to be thought over whether Gayatree was a metre or Vishnu. Depending upon this and on the side of Brahma Gayatree and Jyoti are to be found in the same context and hence there is no incompatibility, and on the back-ground of this do you think that whether 'in the heaven' and 'above the heaven' do not make or make much difference. In that context whether the difference of Ablative and Locative make much difference; or the same thing only from a different point of view. This includes certain implication. It is also to be thought over in the case of Brahma for what purpose well known words were set aside and unknown words like Gayatree accepted.

PurvaPaksha is expressed in the following way : This Gayatree is a metre only and not Vishnu; for Gayatree conventionally connotes a metre only. That which runs counter to PurvaPaksha is now put forth.

No doubt there is no scope for PurvaPaksha to rise. For already before this, exclusive marks, are shown to

contradict non-exclusive Shruties like Jyoti.Shruti; here the exclusive marks भूतादिपाद aided by such Shruties like 'यद्वैतद्ब्रह्म' easily contradict Shruti of Gayatree. Hence no PurvaPaksha has scope to arise, Yet entertaining a greater doubt the PurvaPaksha rises up.

Now Jyoti in Agni-Sutka rightly refers to Vishnu For there is no difference of statements, But here is Jyoti which is in the Shruti where ablative (दिक्:तस्मिन्) is used. On the other hand Gayatree in association with Locative cannot refer to Vishnu. Others still contend that Jyoti which is said to be visible and cannot be Vishnu when Jyoti that is Vishnu is said to be beyond the senses of eye and ear. Therefore Gayatree also is not Vishnu. These two doubts are expressly mentioned in the Sutra उपदेशभेदत्.

Others still contend that when Agni-Sukta is said to be Vishnu Shruti, really its reference to others is proved false; but words like Gayatree, Vak, Prithvee and many others do not lose their reference to others. For these words are mentioned in "गायत्रीवा इदं सर्वं" "वासवैगायत्री" and "इयं वावसेयं पृथ्वी" and it is not right to rob them of their natural reference. Why we may also contend that transfiguration of Gayatree into all is not just. Therefore बहुधात्र in Gayatree is proper, Then even in the case of Brahma his changing into many forms is not correct.

All these doubts are based on the Pramanas. Now the one based on the Prameya is (the object or the Thing itself). In Akashadhi karana Akasha comes into existence and its essence vivaratva or hollowness also being its attribute is also some thing that is produced. So is the cause of

applicability of the word Jyoti which is mutable. And hence it is but proper that it should be subordinate to God's will. But Gayatree forms a part of Veda which is accepted as eternal and its essence is * गानत्राणकर्तृत्व (Singing and protecting) being eternal does not depend upon the will of God. Because it is its nature and nature is never created but has been eternally there. Therefore it is not subordinate to the will of God. This attribute is not inherent in Brahma. So if Gayatree loses its popular reference to other things than Vishnu, then there is no primary meaning at all. Therefore Gayatree is not Vishnu; but a metre only. This is Purvapaksha.

The question of eternity of Veda is thrashed out here. It is not right to say that Veda being eternal has its essence independent of God. For in the commentay to Tattvanirnaya while commenting upon 'नित्यावेदासमस्ताश्च' it is stated that letters being eternal and pervasive have no 'order' of their own. But without order there cannot be either a word or a sentence. Therefore we must admit that order is introduced by human effort in the Veda therefore how can veda be authorless?

This objection is rejoined by the statement that veda has no unchanging eternity, but it has uniformity both in meaning and in word through out veda. Therefore though 'order' is something created and there is scope for human opinion, yet as there is no independent writer, authorlessness is compatible in veda.

Note :- गानकर्तृत्वं अर्थप्रतिपादकत्वम् singing is interpreting or representing the sense of Veda. त्राणकर्तृत्वं is अध्येतृणां पापेभ्यो रक्षकत्वम्. Protecting the students of Veda from Sins.

Hence Veda has a beginning and hence the objector's argument is right. But this objection is explained away by elucidating the quotations given. In the Tattvasankhyana Teeka it is stated 'नित्यत्वं नामकूटस्थतया अद्यतशून्यत्वं'. Veda has neither beginning nor end being through out unchanging. As for 'Order' of letters which is the out come of the operation of intellect, it is first conceived in the mind of God, which is eternal; and hence it is also eternal. Thus taking into consideration the unbroken chain of the eternal mind of God even at the time of Pralaya out of which comes out the Veda to be preserved with effort, Veda is said to be eternally unchanging in some places. But this mentally conceived Veda is beyond the reach of understanding of any. Hence its expression in physical order is essential and this vocal order cannot be eternal and beginningless; hence it cannot be unchanging, as expressed in some other places.

Now Raghavendra quotes profusely from important sources to corroborate his argument or elucidation. In Sudha Viyat Pada it is stated that Jani or birth is manifestation of the power of expression of the meaning in a special manner. so as to suit the special order (of words), that is constant." In TarkaTandava it is stated that a teacher of the modern days recites Veda in the present days following the order which has been in his mind since long always following today the order of yesterday. Accordingly even God also follows the order of the Veda in his mind which has been there running eternally from age to age the present order always depending upon the past. If according to Annuyakhana ज्ञानं नित्यं क्रियानित्याकान शक्तिः परात्मनः the action of God is beginningless and endless

(eternal) then even those that are brought about by it are eternal.

Now if Krama or Succession is brought about by the mind of God and hence, is eternal, then Veda is subservient to the will of God. For it is not right to say that, that which is subservient to his will, is not subordinate to him. Hence God can conceive any other order of words.

But this objection is not sound. For Veda has no other beginninglessness than being the concept in the eternal mind of God. Yet this beginninglessness is accepted as a proved fact and still it is accepted as subordinate to the will of God. Then Veda has no purpose to serve. But it is proved that the souls or Jivas are subordinate to God and this is the purpose. Thus here is no futility at all.

Rahavendra explains how by आकार भेद (difference in form) both कर्णादि विदूरत्व and दृष्टत्वादि (Inaccessible to the ear and eye, and Visibility and audibility) are reconciled. देशकालगुणाद्यपरिच्छिन्नत्वेन आकारेण कर्णादिविदूरत्व) Inaccessibility to the ear and eye is explained as 'unlimited in space, time, and qualities while दृष्टत्वादिकं, as 'not fully Visible and audible'. Or कर्णादि विदूरत्व is 'inaudibility and invisibility in pure and essential form (केवल) while दृष्टत्वादि is Visibility and audibility of from official controlling some subordinate entity.

Now the question of applicability of गायत्री and वाक् to Vishnu is taken up for critical review. गायत्री is Vishnu; for he recites Veda (to Brahma) and protects the people. These two are the peculiar attributes of Vishnu which are to be used in meditation of Vishnu in the mind (चेतोर्पणनिगदात्).

But Veda is eternal and so is Gayetree a part of it. But a thing that is eternal is not found to be dependent. Yet Just as eternal qualities are found to depend upon the qualified substantive; so also eternal Shruti (in the form of Gayatree) can be subordinate to Vishnu for our good.

Now chandrikakara cites many such metaphysical anomalies accepted by all systems as serving good purpose in furthering philosophical thought. For instance in the Vaisheshika system the dimensions of Akasha are beginningless and eternal and yet are subservient to Akasha which is their Support. In Advaita system, the contact of Atma and nescience or the Bheda or difference between Jeeva and Brahma, though eternal depends on Nescience being the other pole of contact. Other wise even when contact is withdrawn Nescience might not disappear. Parbhakara a school among Meemansakas hold that Moksha is nothing but antecedent non existence of misery and hence is beginningless; and yet needs the aid of knowledge. In the same manner if we admit that the cause of applicability of Gayatee is eternal and beginning less, our logical consistency does not suffer when we admit its subordination to Vishnu.

But Subordination to Vishnu is nothing more than Subjection to production; and hence how can a beginningless thing be subordinate to any other thing. It cannot be argued that its imperishableness is its subordination. For a beginningless thing is naturelly imperishable and does not need others help. Nor can you contend that even an unreasonable thing when made an instance in the illustration in some other systems would be accepted. A thing

having a beginning needs help of others in being produced. But as for Sustenance, things having both beginning and no beginning stand in the same rank both needing others help; thus God's help is needed by both

But it is objected that Vishnu being both creator and destroyer, when creation takes place creatures continue to live of their own accord till they are destroyed; and in the case of a destroyer no function like protection is consistent with that of his destruction. Hence protection or sustenance is not compatible with destruction in Vishnu. But Shruti tells that protection also is a function of Vishnu as creation and destruction. In प्रकृतैत यत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेचति mere creation alone is denied in Vishnu. For more than that protection is described heartily. Hence protection more than creation or destruction redounds to his fame. Just as in created things there is the inexorable control of Lord Hari in their maintenance; so also in uncreated things. Servants depend upon kings for acquisition and protection of things.

But if beginningless things depend upon God; he may even do away with those things as we do, dispensing with pots and pans. But such a dispensation is not to be found. Hence Dependableness on God is not justified.

But God has indisputable and undisputed power. Otherwise you cannot prove his unchecked power or authority. Only he does not will or desire to use it wildly. His unlimited power is an unchallenged truth. But why should not an eternal thing be subordinate to our exercise of power? The answer is simple though unpalatable. For we have not the unlimited wealth of power of God. Therefore

how can the beginningless nature subservient to beginningless desire of God, refuse to be under the control of God ?

But already in Akashadhikarana all natures (of things) are said to be under the control of God. Then what new thing is asserted in this Adhikarana ? In Akashadhikarana Nature as such (in general) was said to be subordinate to the will of God. But here nature even of beginningless things is shown to be depending upon God's will.

Arguments continue till the whole topic of the Adhikarana is thrashed out thread bare and the conclusion is reached: Therefore Vishnu alone is referred to by words (in Veda) like Gayatree and others.

In other interpretations of this Adhikarana the Sutras are not properly construed and connected. Hence inter relationship is properly shown. In the first Sutra the reason mentioned in the Upakrama is expressed. Raghavendra makes the point clear. The Upakrama statement is गायति त्रायतिच and the reason is that "because he recites Veda and protects" therefore Gayatree is Vishnu.) In the second Sutra (भूतादिषादन्यपदेशात् it is quoted that संपाचतुष्पदा गायत्री thus Gayatree's six varieties are cited and its four Padas are asserted. Then Purusha sukta's hymn is referred to (तदेतद्व्याख्युक्तम्) in which तवानम्यमहिमा is cited. This hymn points out the Linga भूतादिषाद. Thus when the Side of the Sutrakara is well established by these two Sutras, in the third Sutra (उपदेशभेदात्) two contradictory statements like दिविस्थितं दिवःपरं are made and the apparent Contradiction is removed by Stating that the same meaning is expressed by them in different forms.

Here both Shankara and Ramanuja form this Adhi Karana with four Sutas. The interpretation of the Adhi Karana by these two is criticised by condemning their interpretation of the sutras and Vishaya Vakyas (topical statements). Now चरणाभिधानात् means पादाभिधानात्; which refers to Chandogya तदेतद् चाभ्युक्तं पादोऽस्य सर्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्या मृतदिवि. In this पाद is mentioned. Brevity and faithfulness to Shruti would recommend Padabhidhanat in the Sutra, in the place of Charanabhidhanat. But the illustration of 'हृदय आहितंयत्' which amounts to 'placed in the cavity of the heart' with the statement of Jyoti enabls us to raise an objection on Anandamayadhi Karana. Then the Purvapaksha is justified, Without that objection the citing of अथयदतः is not justified.

After many more objections against the interpretation of these two, Chandrikakara comes to the conclusion that there is no other sutra citing Pada than Mantra Varnika and that is already stated by Charanabhidhanat; hence in other Schools there is no scope for the Sutra भूतादिपादव्यपदेशात्. But equally Strong objection is raised against our interpretation. According to our interpretation the Sutra ought to have been भूतपाद व्यपदेशात्. For पादो ऽस्य is easily conveyed by भूतपाद. Hence according to our interpretation the word आदि in भूतादि is useless.

This objection would have been right if only भूतपादत्व had been meant. But भूतपाद means विश्वपाद and in the same manner the other three padas, Narayana, Vasudeva, and Vaikuntha are meant. Thus Bhuta Pada means 'Four Padas' (चतुःपादा) in all. So the compound भूतादि should

be dissolved as भूतविश्वं आदिः यस्यरूपत्रयस्य This means भूत together with three essential Padas. Thus Vishnu having four Padas is very well justified and hence the very existence of the Sutra also is not redundant.

But this raises a new objection. In the Mantra many Bhutas are meant and hence many Padas are necessitated. So it is not stated that भूताः have one pada and the other three forms have three Padas.

This objection is squarely met with. First a corroborative evidence from Meemansa is chosen and cited. In the third Adhya first Pada and seventh Adhikarana it is stated that दशापवित्रेण ग्रहंसमाप्ति. दशापवित्र is either a piece of woolen blanket or a piece of cotton cloth. 'House must be cleaned or washed with a piece of cloth or woolen blanket.' Now the question is whether one house to be washed or all the houses; it is the Shruti that decides the number of objects of statement as it does, the number of the means in the statement. In पशुनायजेन the उपादेय or means namely पशु has its number one. So also the object ग्रह has the number one. 'one' which is not a part of the sacrifice is meant or not is a doubtful thing. But in a similar shruti 'one' is a part of Pashu; it cannot be a part of sacrifice which is expressed by a different word in the sentence. So this one which is not a part of sacrifice is not meant (to be involved in the injunction). This is the Purva Paksha

But the Sidhanta is that one is meant to be involved in the injunction. For this oneness is involved in the Karika which is very close to the original word (प्राति

पदिक) and is the chief thing. But this oneness having discarded the meaning of the original word which is just before it (पशुना) seeks association with the Verbal activity being syntactically related to the Sentence. Then indirectly that oneness becomes related to Pashu, as its adjunct. This oneness has its purpose served when associated with यज्ञ. Hence oneness is meant to be involved in the function of yajna. This is the Shidhanta.

To come to the point at issue, just as Pashu is the object in the enjoiment of Sacrifice, So also oneness of the Pashu is involved in it. In the Same manner one ness of Pada also is meant to be expressed.

But if Bhuta means Vishnu then Bhuta is different from Vishnu who thus cannot be one with Vishva. Hence he cannot be Bhuta pada. And you cannot argue that just as chaitra is a fourth part of Maitra, though different from him, so also Vishva though different from Vishnu is a fourth part or Pada of Vishnu. So Vishnu is said to be Vishva; for it is a fourth part, in Strength, of Vishnu and not because it is of the same essence.

But the word pada is mentioned once in the Sutra (भूतादिषादव्यपदेशात्) and it is found only once in the Shruti and its reference to Bhutas is not primary, with reference to Amrita in their three essences is primary. This fact is made clear by an instance from Jaimini Sutra. "पौर्णमास्यां पौर्णमास्या यजेत" (one should offer on the full moon day with Purnamasee). Here the word Purnamasee with a locative case ending connotes 'the full moon day' the time (kala) of Sacrifice primarily; while the same

word with an instrumental case ending refers to. Some karma related to that secondarily, In Jaimini Sutra (11-2-2) Darsa and Purnamas are to be offered on two separate holy Occasions. Then should the minor offerings be repeated each time? This is the doubt. The Purva-pakshi contends that this batch of six sacrifices having the same fruit and having the beginning and end, once performed will aid all sacrifices. To this the rejoinder is that though it is known that each one having the same fruit, has the same process of performance, yet the time of recitation being different the process also differs.

• पूर्णमास्यां पूर्णमास्या यजेत । अमावास्यां अमावास्या यजेत
These are the two injunctions. Purnamasi and Amavasya are the two instruments which must be used in a sacrificial activity for the desired fruit. This is the meaning of the termination. As an aid to this performance the necessary periods of time Purnamasee and Amavasya are prescribed. Therefore even minor offerings that are included in the instruments, fruit, and action of the major Sacrifices have this time fixed, therefore in every process these minor Sacrifices also should be repeated. This is the Sidhanta.

Just as the word with the locative case ending is Considered important in denoting time and the word ending in the instrumental case is unimportant in indicating the time of that sacrifice; so is the case here. In the same manner in प्रथमयोः the word Prathama means both Prathama and Dviteeya. So also in the Sutra, the mention of the word पाद includes both major and minor meanings. Therefore त्रिपात् which has the word पाद, has a primary meaning

referring to the essence of Vishnu; while in पादोऽस्य referring to essence of a different thing from Vishnu, the पाद has minor meaning. Thus the first and the third Sutra as interpreted by the two Systematisers (Shankara, and Ramana) stand refuted by this explanation. Now in the second Sutra चेतोर्पणनिगदात्, Brahma is the locus (अधिष्ठान) for Gayatree according to Shankara. And through छंदस् (गायत्री) one should get peace of mind. For this peace of mind it is stated that गायत्री वा इदं सर्वं । Gayatree is one with all. But this is refuted in the respective places by stating that Brahman cannot be the locus for illusions.

Now the fourth Sutra उभयस्मिन्नप्यविरोधात् has been interpreted by others differently. "Just as a hawk in contact with the top of a tree may be said to be 'on the top of the tree' and also 'above the top of the tree'; so also Brahma in heaven may be said to be above heaven. It is further explained that just as the hawk even disconnected with the top is said to be above the top and on the top, so also Brahma above heaven may very well be said to be in heaven

In the first instance it is admitted that Brahma is in heaven and on that, his being above heaven is explained and in the second instance his being above heaven is accepted and on that his being in heaven is explained. One must remember that Locative means 'Support' and ablative means "lower limit for comparison (अवधि) It must also be remembered that both आधारस्त्व and अवधित्व in reference to the same thing cannot be primarily true. If one is primarily true (मुख्य) the other must be

only secondarily true (अमुख्य). But shruti should be accepted only in its primary meaning; and its illustration cannot be quoted for its opposite meaning.

Now this interpretation is refuted. one thing is primarily a Support or limit to another thing; then if the same thing is a support or limit secondarily to the same (another thing) then you cannot make use of such sentences as the hawk is above the tree and others and hence you cannot have an illustration to your interpretation.

In this connection Bhamati Kara says — when the meaning of 'Support' is important, there in the context of वृक्षाग्रात् (when it is in contact with the top of the tree) the word 'hawk' means by implication the whole of hawk consisting of parts of hawk that is above the hawk which is in contact with the top of the tree. Raghavendra adds a note here. 'As there is no contact of the hawk with the lower part of the top, the expression 'above the top means' above the lower part of the top. When on the other hand the meaning of 'limif' (अवधि) is important then (अग्रे) in 'on the top' the locative means only Vicinity so that the hawk is only hovering round the top without actual contact with it. Thus in the illustrated sentence the word Jyoti or the Stem ज्योतिर् in दिवः or the locative in दिवि have all implied meaning. But in the Jyoti which is Brahma there are no parts comprising it.

Some other explanation also is recorded for review and refute. Then still another is taken up for critical review. Though his interpretation is very shallow still Raghavendra quotes him fully and notes down the defects

in detail. The Vishaya Vakya is यदतः परोदिवोज्योतिः and here the doubt is whether Shiva is Jyoti or some one else. Now Diva is Akasha which is meant to be either physical hollowness outside our body or the अंतरिक्षलोक. So one above Diva is the sun above it. But the Jyoti inside the body is the fire in the Stomach. But he is said to have all Bhutas as his Pada. This cannot be found in Gayatree, therefore Jyoti is Shiva only, This is sidhanta, As for उपदेशभेद the explanation offered by Bhamati is accepted.

This is refuted. It is already stated that the instance given does not agree and that Charana (Pada) also equally does not fit in, with Bhamati's explanation of Upadesha-bhedat is already refuted.

Vak and others are in context. Hence four footedness also cannot be adjusted. But in Shivarka manideepika it is stated that "cowpen in the river" when read with deep 'river' means 'bank' as it is associated with the river. So also गायत्री वा इदं सर्वं भूतं followed by वाग्वै गायत्री means that Bhuta is Gayatree in the form of Vak; and is not different from it.

But this cannot be accepted. For according to your version you can not refute fivefootedness of Gayatree or Jyoti along with Prana. And as Vak is an adjective qualifying Gayatree you cannot get six varieties. But he tries to establish six Varieties thus: Sarva Bhutas are established in Prithivi and remain not transgressing the two varieties.

Then Prana is to be established in the body and the heart; and remain not transgressing them. As there are two supports in all there are four varieties- all making

six varictics". But it is easier to find six varicties in the forms of Bhut and others. Besides, to count one attribute as 'two only because it is found in two resepticles, is not reasonable as it leads to absurdities. Scriptural evidences are quoted to prove that Vishnu is tobe found in Gayatree. many more shruties and smritics are quoted to prove that Jyoti is Narayana by the exclusive marks of Narayana like 'the husband of Lakshmee and the father of Brahma'. Hence 'placed in heaven and 'placed above heaven are to be reconciled oniy by three worlds theory and seven worlds theory.

PADANTYA PRANADHIKARANAM BHASHYA

Prana was said to be Vishnu. But in तावाएताः शीर्वन् द्वियःश्रिताश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनोवाक्प्राणः ऐ. आ.२-९-४) There (In respect of Prana already quoted) in the Aitareya, Prana is not said to be Vishnu. "These very same (eye, ears, mind speech and Prana and their Presiding deties) are placed on the head (of four faced Brahma)" For Prana is cited in the group of senses. Therefore (the sutra kara) says—

SUTRA

प्राणस्तथानुगमात् २८

Prana (cited from Taittareeya (तद्वैत्वं प्राणः) as well as from Aitareya) is Vishnu only. For he is uniformly said to be expressed freuqently by the word Brahman along with marks of Vishnu like 'worshipped by gods'.

BHASHYA

(तं देवाः प्राणयंत) 'Gods preached about Him. (स एषोऽसुः ल एष प्राणः). He is Asu because he destroys the evil minded and he is Prana because he is the source of joy to the good. (प्राण ऋच इत्येव विद्यात) One should know that hymns propound him prominently. (तदयं प्राणमवितिष्ठति) This Prana (Vayu and Vishnu) places himself in the chariot (the body). These and others repeatedly declare Prana to be Vishnu.

So also here Prana is Vishnu.

In Skanda it is stated that

“Gods preached only Vishnu. They worship Him as Bhuti (knowledge and wealth) He is the only topic propounded in all Vedas. This body is said to be his Chariot. And in this context the Brahma is uniformly repeated.

SUTRA

न वक्तुः आत्मोपदेशादिति चेत् अद्यात्मसंबन्धभूमा ह्यस्मिन्—२९

वक्ता or Speaker is Viswamitra the Composer of Brahatai sahasra. To him Indra Preached about himself as Prana. (So Indra is Prana and not Vishnu. (But this is) not (correct). For in this context Bhagavan Vishnu is said to be in contact with many bodies of Indra and Vishwamitra and others. (or frequently a Supreme spirits' contact with Indra and others.)

BHASHYA

(प्राणोवा अहमस्मि ऋषे), Indra addresses sage Viswamitra as Rishi and told the sage that he was Prana. So, because Indra calls himself 'Prana' therefore he is Prana and not Vishnu. But this is not true (प्राणः त्वं प्राणः सर्वाणि भूतानि) For it is said that 'you are Prana and Prana is all beings' which means that he is related to many bodies as their immanent controller.

SUTRA शास्त्रदृष्ट्यातूपदेशो वामदेववत् ॥ ३० ॥

Just as Vamadeva said about himself that he was one with Manu and Surya from the point of View of Immanent god, (So also is the preaching of Viswamitra that he is Prana) and not from the point of view of identity.

BHASHYA

Here Shastra means Vishnu who is the immanent God. For it is said in Bhagavata that "He is Pure knowledge सवित्) and immanent god (शास्त्रं) For Vishnu actuates every one, being an immanent controller and the great resort.

In Padma Purana it is said that Vishnu is called by those names (which are popular names of others); for the reason of his being the controller. There is no one name which is not His name, and is the name of Jeeva and other Things.

In this respect the great evidence is (अहं मनुः
अभवं सूर्यंश्च) that “I was Manu and Surya.”

SUTRA जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गाच्चेति चेतोपासा त्रैविध्यादाधितत्वात्
इह तद्योगात् ॥ ३१ ॥

The marks of Jeeva and Mukhya prana are heard in the Shruti and hence Prana is not Vishnu but some one else. But this contention is not fair. (For there is uniform repetition and Lingas or marks to refer to the immanent form). Thus only three kinds of upasana can be adjusted. And this fact of three kinds of upasana has been stated. These three kinds of upasanas refer to three kinds of aspirants who are eligible for them.

BHASHYA

(तावन्ति शतसंवत्सरस्य अह्नां सहस्राणि भवन्ति । “So many thousands of days of hundred years (would be the life periods of Jeeva)” Thus there is the mark of Jeeva. And in the dialogue of Prana (and Indriyas) there is the mark of Mukhya Prana. Therefore Prana is not Vishnu.

But it is not correct to say that Prana is not Vishnu. (The marks of Jeeva and Mukhya Prana do not run Counter to this statement). (For he is immanent and this is very useful for inward meditation) And this meditation is of three kinds—meditation of Vishnu as 1) immanent

in the body, as 2) out side the body and 3) as pervasive or ubiquitous This has been mentioned here.

(We know that three kinds of meditation have been mentioned here) because it is stated that he Lord Vasudeva) tearing the boundry (the middle portion of the head) through this passage (Sushumna Nadi) attained (the heart of four faced Brahma).

(स एतमेव पुरुषं ब्रह्मतत्त्वं अपश्यत्) He Narayana having entered this body saw Brahma of essential attributes (of unlimited nature.)

“Knowing all this, Mahidasa the son of Itara said. (एतदस्मै तद्विद्वान् आह महिदासः एतरेयः) These and many other statements (declare the three kinds of Upasana). In Brahmanda it is said that one named Mahidasa was born from Itara by Virtue of penance. He is Lord Vishnu him self, who wrote a work on Vishnu.

“Men, (Sages, Gandharvas and gods) have their respective ways of worship outside, inward, ubiquitous) depending upon their own intrinsic merit.”

“This Hari or Purushottama is worshipped by some as ubiquitous, by others in their heart and still by others as staying outside.” Thus it is stated in Brahmanda.

It is also stated that "Those who perform sacrifice, worship Hari in Fire. Sages worship him in their hearts, the ignorant find him in the idols and the well initiated serve him every where.

Thus ends the first Pada of the first Adhyaya

BHAVADEEPA

Tattva prakasikakar offers the connecting link of this Adhi Karana, with the shastra stating that this Adhi Karana treats the samanyaya of words, popularly referring to others than Vishnu, in Vishnu. But Raghavendra has unearthed an apparent Contradiction to this connecting link and has answered the objection. Just as Akasha is shown to refer to vishnu in आकाशस्तल्लिङ्गात् so also Prana is stated to refer to vishnu in अतएव प्राणः so Prana is उभयत्रप्रसिद्ध and not अन्यत्रप्रसिद्ध as stated by Teekacharya. Yet even the Prana of the former sutra is included in the unsettled group of words. Hence this Prana is justified when called अन्यत्रप्रसिद्ध

In the status of dialectics the Prana of former sutra is shaky. For the Prana of this sutra has many strong reasons to refer to others and hence it is secure in its signifying of others. Yet the Prana of former sutra is not so safe in signifying others. For there are no strong marks in its favour to help it in connoting others. On the other hand there are such strong marks of Vishnu as 'being the husband of Laxmi' which are unequivocally true.

The meaning of "It is not right that Prana is Vishnu" is that there Prana is not used in the sense of Vishnu. But it is used in the Sense of Vayu. This is the Purva paksha. Besides Prana is cited in the Company of lower Senses and hence it cannot aspire to be the name of the most supreme Lord. But Mukhya Prana is the master of all senses. Indra is the controller of the hand and hence he is also one of the senses. And Jeeva is one who is the resort of the fruit of the sense activity. No doubt Sidhanti is favoured with many strong statements and marks on his side. Yet when one of them is exclusive in application to Hari, it should be made to adjust itself to apply to Vayu.

Thus when the Purva Pakshi is entrenched behind strong defence, the presenting of Shruti and marks is to make the strong side of Purvapaksha still stronger.

In the previous sutra Prana was said to be Vishnu. In expressing both doubt and conclusion the word अयं is used. So which is the better अयं of the two cannot be settled. Yet it is possible to estle which of the two is अयं. Hence you cannot say that Doubt and PurvaPaksha bear no distinction. The determination of being अयं only holds good in the case of the present Prana and not the previous Prana. For in the case of that previous Prana there is exclusive mark applying only to Vishnu and that is 'the husband of Laxmi'. So that Prana cannot be said to be other than Vishnu (being Vishnu himself).

Hence this Prana being contended by Purva Paksha to be 'other' than Vishnu, Sutrakar Says that Prana is Vishnu.

Raghavendra Supplies us many gaps and missed links, In the Bhashya instead of Saying तं भूतिरितिदेवाः it is said स एषोसुः सप्राणः which brings the previous text to bear upon the present text to show how तं is to be relinked here. He further shows that Prana is propounded by all the Vedas.

Then Prana is said to have body as the Chariot, अथ देवः वायुः श्रोत्रे पक्षसी चक्षुषीयुक्ते मनः संग्रहीता तदयं प्राणः अद्विच्छति । Now the Physical and divine Chariot of Vishnu and vayu is described. This chariot (physical) has speech or (divinely) Uma as rope. The ears (right and left) are (divinely) Chandra and his wife. They are physically his two horses yoked by his side. The two eyes are Surya and his wife divinely. But physically they are two horses joined to the front yoke. Mind is the charioteer who holds the reins, (Physically) while divinely he is Rudra. And Prana or Vishnu presides over this body Chariot,

Raghavendra explains तदयं in तदयंप्राणः अद्विच्छति as a Compound following Teeka kara सच असौ अयंच तदयं and this goes with प्राणः! Or तद् and अयं may be two separate words. Then the Sentence is construed as अयं प्राणः तद् रयतया उक्तं शरीरं अद्विच्छति. (This Prana occupies this body-chariot as Controller.)

In the original it is merely said यदाहुः and Raghavendra Supplies the agent word (विष्णुत्वनिर्णयोक्त ब्रह्मतर्कवचन कर्तारः) the author of Brahmataarka as mentioned in Vishnu Tattva vinirnaya.

Purvapashkee had adduced the reason that Prana was mentioned among the senses and hence Prana was Mukhya Prana and not Vishnu. Now accepting the exclusive nature of application of this mark, Sidhanti presented marks of Vishnu in great number showing their exclusive nature of application. Other wise there was no necessity of putting forth their manifoldness or their exclusive nature. For it would have been sufficient to adduce one mark of exclusive application or many marks having other applications in order to refute one mark having other applications. This also refutes the case of Purva Pakshee who has many shruties in favour. For they have other references. But in the case of Sidhantee, there are Shrutees of exclusive reference and many in number.

(न वक्तुः आत्मोपदेशात् २९)

in the present Sutra प्राणोविष्णुः should be imported and constined with न ; but he is Indra only. Because the previous sentence इंद्रः उवाच प्राणोवा अहमस्मि tells us that Prana declared himself Indra before Viswamitra. But the declaration of Prana might be merely to deceive. Or even if it be true, it might be true in respect of its immanent occupant. Both are not warranted. For Indra Cannot be the deceitful adviser of Viswamitra who told Indra about Some Special Shastra. Now Viswamitra is the teacher of Brihatee Sahasra to Indra; hence there is no reason for Indra to deceive Viswamitra. Nor the latter holds good. (प्राण उदक्रामत्) Prana exits the body. So Prana is either Jeeva or Mukhya prana, But this is not so The reason given in the Sutra is उपासा त्रैविध्यात् and इह

आश्रितत्वात्. But this reason is not sufficiently strong to refute the objection directly. So Raghavendra suggests that after न, शास्त्रदृष्ट्या should be inserted in the Sutra. Now the purport of all this is that Prana is Vishnu only (two negatives make one एव or only). Here also as before अनुगमात् and नचलिङ्ग विरोधः should be construed and लिङ्गानां should be then construed, (Teeka) Lingas should refer to the immanent. Non-activity is in respect of the outside form of Vishnu which is different from the immanent.

It is stated in Bhagavata III skanda Tatparya. that "Hari residing in yajna or Jayanta entering in two padas himself raised both of them. As for Brahma, he sleeps in part and in another part he gets out, along with Vayu and Vishnu. So Brahma, will not be without Prana and Prana will not be without Brahma. Hence when Prana goes out it is not possible for Brahma to stay there.

Immanent form is resorted to, for the sake of upasana or meditative worship. He occupies three places namely: the eye, the neck and the heart. Now the aspirant sees the form in his heart. Narayana enters into him with two Padas. Then he approaches his heart through the Sushumna Nadi where he assumes the Vasudeva form. He is full of perfections and spreads every where and is eternal. It is this form that he sees. Thus for the sake of inner meditation it is said that the Lord who breaks open the head which is the last boundry of this body, and enters the heart through Sushumna. Though the word upasana is not expressly heard still as there would be no purpose to mention by the law of presumption we must suppose that all this is for upasana.

For outword worship Mahidas is mentioned. He is an ordinary Rishi as supposed by some. Had it been so it would be easily proved to be a Rishi by his name एतरेयः (the son of Itara). An authority need not be quoted. Even when there is the quotation to show that he is a muni yet it all means that one so far known as muni is declared in the Shruti to be Bhagavan himself.

But upasana is said to be of four kinds and not three. And there in, the out side-upasana is not mentioned. To remove this doubt Bhashya quotes another evidence. अग्नौ क्रियायताम् विष्णुः this is considered Bahirupasana. प्रतिमासु अप्रबुद्धानाम् (the ignorant worships him in many idols) in Various idols. (variety is objectionable and not idol worship). Again even in the case of those who have been prescribed out side worship for their Moksha, meditation of Hari in the heart, is essential to some extent. Wrong worship is condemned in the Sutra नप्रतीकेन हि सः ब्रह्मतत्तमं means Brahma that is ubiquitous and that this all pervasive is said to be residing in the heart is figurative (false) as Brahmanda Contained in the Mustard seed, Hence this division into three Varieties of worship is not reasonable. This objection is satisfactorily explained in the coming Adhikarana Vyomavat

For these reasons Prana is Vishnu only and he is Anandamaya Hence his investigation is Very well justified. As for the dispute about the Vishaya Vakya of this Adhikarana we deal with it in the Prakasha on Chandrika in this context.

NYAYA MUKTAVALI

This Adhikarana Consists of three Sutras : 1) न वक्तु रात्मोपदेशादिति 2) शास्त्रदृष्ट्यातूपदेशोवामदेववत् 3) जीवमुख्य प्राणलिंगान्नेतिचेत्तेपासात्रैविध्यादाश्रितत्वादिहृतद्योगात् ।

The thought link of this Adhikarana is to be found in taking an exception to what has been already decided depending upon the principle of multifariousness of Shruti and Linga. In Aitareya upanishad Prana is stated तावा एताः शीर्षं चिह्नं यः श्रिताश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनोवाक् प्राणं ' in many such places, There is a doubt if this Prana were Mukhya Prana or Vishnu. Purva Paksha Considers Prana to be either Vayu, Indra or Jeeva. For there are many Shruties and Lingas in their favour. For instance Prana is recited in association with चक्षुश्चोत्र and others. ताः अहिंसन्त and others introduce to us the disputes of prana-Exit and entrances of Prana from and into the body. Then the test of the fall and rise of the body, And dialogues of Prana—All these are the in variable marks of Mukhya Prana.

Then the associated Shrutes like तं वषटं वर्षाण्यभ्यर्चन्तु and many others afford marks of Jeeva. Then others like 'killing of Vritra' and others are the sure marks of Indra. Thus you find many Shruties and Lingas in favour of Purva Paksha. And these cannot be fully applied to Vishnu.

Now Shidhanta begins : There many Shruties like एतद्ब्रह्म तत्सत्यं and many others which express 'An object of worship' 'propounded by all the Vedas' 'residence in the Suryamandala' All pervasiveness' and many other marks invariably indicating Vishnu. These Shruties are

greater in number than those already quoted. The previously cited Shruties and Lingas can be easily applied to Vishnu who is immanent in those things indicated by them. उदासीनवदास्ताम् (He remained indifferant) refers to the outside form of Vishnu.

As for the quotation 'अहंप्राणः' said by Indra refers to Vishnu as in अहं मनुः said by Vamadeva either Secondly or by the rule of Antaryami (सर्वतियायि को विष्णुः --- सर्वं नाम्नाभिधीयते) अहं refers to Vishnu primarily, as all pronouns refer to Vishnu in the chief sense.

The purpose of the discussion was to raise objection against Calling Vishnu by the name of Prana and then to refute it.

TANTRA DEEPIKA

प्राणः तथा अनुगमात्

In this Adhi Karana we find the Samanvaya in Vishnu of the Names which refer to others than Vishnu on the Strength of multiplicity of strong marks. In Aitareya many times we read Prana beginning from तावा एताः Just as in तद्वैत्वं प्राणः Prana is Brahma. So also this is Brahma only; and not Jeeva, or Indra or Mukhya prana. For in this context it is found that there is (अनुगमात्) repetition of Shruti and Linga like the word Brahma and, object of worship by the gods. In the Sutra the word तथा is used to remind the cause of application of Prana which was Considered by the Purvapakshi to be cause of life in Jeeva. So तथा is used as in तथा=वत्प्रतिषेधात् and तथाप्राणः OR तथा is used in the sense that (सचअर्थच) the formerly used Prana and this latterly used one are both

(तथा) Brahma only. The word अनुगम also signifies that the chapter is fully dedicated to Vishnu only.

A satisfactory rejoinder to the objection to what has been said is expressed in the Sutra न वक्तुरात्मोपदेशात् इति चेत् अध्यात्मसंबन्धभूमाहस्मिन् To Vishvamitra the author of Brihatee Sahasva Indra said—"oh Sage I am Prana" and thus identified himself with Prana. Hence Prana is not Brahma or Vishnu. But this is not correct. For in this context in the (अध्यात्म) bodies (of Vishnu, in Indra and Viswamitra) there is great relationship (of Vishnu) as stated in Shruties like प्राणोहं प्राणस्त्वं प्राणः सर्वाणि भूतानि Relation ship with many is declared. Hence Prana is Vishnu.

What Indra preached was only the ubiquitous nature of Brahma here called Prana and not his identity with Prana. Or in this (अस्मिन्) Indra there is great divine possession (संबन्धभूमा) of the great Atma (अधि आत्मा) And hence with reference to that fact Indra said that he was Prana.

Really speaking आत्मोपदेशात् is enough and अवतुः is used as a reason by the Purva Pakshi to show that Indra Calling him self Prana was not deceiving the author (वक्तुः) of Brahatee Sahasra. The word संबन्ध (relation ship) shows difference between Indra and Viswamitra and not identity

Then it means that 'Prana is in me' So it is said शास्त्रद्वयानुपदेशो वामवेववत्. नु in this Sutra means only शास्त्र which means (शास्ति इति) immanant controller (सर्वित् शास्त्रं परंपदम् are said to be his names). From this point of view Indra calls himself Prana and not from the

point of identity with him; as illustrated by the advice of Vamadeva. Just as Vamadeva called himself Manu only from this point of View; So also Indra Called him -self Prana. (शास्त्र) from the point of view of inner controller. Instead of using the the word अंतर्यामि the word शास्त्र is used to show that he is connoted primarily by all words as he is controller of all. "Vishnu is connoted primarily by each word as he is the controller of all"

जीवमुख्यप्राणलिगात् तेचेन्न उपासा त्रैविध्यात् आश्रितत्वात् इह तद्योगात् । In this Sutra प्राणः ब्रह्म should be imported. After the first न, शास्त्रदुष्ट्यात्पदेशः should be inserted. So the Sutra means- (तेशतवर्षाणि अभ्यर्चत) there is the mark of Mukhyaprana namely 'hundred years' life' and there is the mark of Mukhyaprana as shown in Prana samvada. So Prana is not Brahma. But this is not tenable For the mark of Jeeva as 'hundred years' life' is with reference to the inner controller. But it is said- 'Both of them are inactive' is with reference to the out side form, why for, this reference to Antaryamee ? Because there are three varieties of the worship of Brahma, one is inner worship, worship every where, and worship out side are the two. And in context the inner variety is referred to in स एतमेव सीमानं विदार्य एतयाद्वारा प्रापद्यत् the ubiquitous in एतमेवपुरुषं ब्रह्मतमं अपश्यत् and the out side in एतद्वस्म वैतद्विद्वानाह महिदास एतरेयः. These three varieties are accepted and quoted here. तद्योगात् means that the three varieties are there instead of one to suit the essential nature of the different aspirants.

Raghavendra explains some grammatical subtlety. उपासात्रैविध्यात् is used in the Sutra. This is a बन्तपुरुष

compound. (उपासायाः त्रेविध्यं तस्मात्) But by an explicit Sutra पूरणगण a compound is prohibited here, yet the Sutra-kara has indulged in making that compound. But this is not a wanton breach of grammatical rule. For this prohibition is optional. Then Raghavendra justifies also the form उपासा.

Raghavendra at the end reminds us that each Adhikarana propounds some important idea about Vishnu besides the tenet of samanvaya in its various forms. In the Anandadhikarana Vishnu's identity with his parts, in the Antaradhikarana, the dependence on Vishnu, of the wealth of gods like Indra and others and of even nature of all kinds in the Akashadhikarana, in Pranadhikarana Vishnu being the cause of all life, in Jyotiradhikarana ignorance being at the basis of popular idea that all hymns treat of something different from Vishnu; in Chandobhidha nadhikarana, dependence on Vishnu of even eternal and beginningless entities, and in the last Pranadhikarana, reference of shruties and Lingas in the respective hymns to the respective immanent forms—are propounded.

Thus ends the first pada of the first Adhyaya.

TATTVAMANJARI:

In Anubhashya there is no word which summarises that last Pranadhikarana. The cause of application of the word Prana is Praneta which has been already referred to in Pranadhikarana. That Praneta also does the work of epitomising the similar Adhikarana (प्राणः तथातुगमात्).

Or Praneta means one who gives life to, and this one was said to be Vishnu. This does not seem to be reasonable. For in ऐतरेय prana is cited with “eye, ear, and mind”

and on this citation and on the strength of dialogue of Indra Prana seems to mean Mukhyaprana. Indra in his discourse with a sage says that he is Prana. Therefore Prana is Indra. 'Man's life comprises hundred years' proves Prana to be Jeeva. Three different sentences put forth the claim of three different claimants. This objection is refuted in four sutras, with प्राणस्तथानुगमात्.

The meaning of the—(the sutra is explained by the the three quarters of the verse at the end 'इत्याद्यः प्रसिद्धेः अन्य वस्तुषु । उच्यते विष्णुरेवैकः सर्वैः सर्वगुणत्वतः॥ By all words famous in signifying others than Vishnu, like Prana and others which are endowed with strong marks indicating Mukhya prana and others, Vishnu alone is surely pointed out; and not many like Mukhyaprana and others. Then there would have been disintegration of the sentence, (वाक्यभेद) as there are different subjects like Mukhyaprana and Jeeva.

Thus Vishnu is the topic, Because सर्वगुणत्वः he is endowed with uncommon attributes found in this chapter, like 'worshipped by all gods, occupying the bodychariot as controller of it. We are warranted in this matter (सर्वगुणत्वतः) by the fact that Vishnu is endowed with the cause of application of Prana which is nothing but the cause of life. And if that cause of application inheres in others he has mastery over it. There is no contradictory mark of others to stultify this contention. (सर्वगुणत्वतः) For in Prana samvada, life of hundred years. and identity of Indra with Prana indicate Jeeva and Indra. But these can be easily adjusted to signify Vishnu by attributing them to his immanent form. And even the state

ment that Vishnu and Brahma (four faced) remained inactive, refer to an outside form of Vishnu.

This reference to immanent form is justified by such statements as ब्रह्मतत्त्वम् which connotes ubiquity. एतयाद्वारा प्रापद्यत signifies inwardness and इत्याहमहीदसः points out outwardness, of Vishnu. This triple variety is stated so as to suit the three types of aspirants.

Thus all words popularly known to connote others than Vishnu are shown to have samanvaya in Vishnu

PRAKASA :

If we read Bhashya of this Pranadhikarna, it seems to refer to Purva Pranadhikarana. But that is not the case. For then this Adhikarana actually refers to Gayatri Adhikarana according to Sudha. Hence it finds its place here. The link is objectionary or exceptionary which is defined as "that which gives scope to a prima facie objection is आपवादिकी संगति" or this depends upon the previous Adhikarana. The link is inter dependence. This also suggests that the instance is the 'words that connote others on the strength of Shruti and Linga in abundance'. this is the implication of the Sutra. This will be made clear in future.

But Bhashya proceeds like this : If in मनो वाक्प्राण Prana is other than Vishnu, then the previous Prana also is the other. So this disquisition fulfils its necessity by deciding that the word decisively connotes Vishnu. Hence the present Adhikarana justifies its existence by supplying a Purpose.

But even when सर्ववेदा यद् पदमानंति refers to other than Vishnu, and one propounded by all the vedas naturally is other than Vishnu, then the source of all shastras (शास्त्रायोगिनि) is also other than Vishnu. This sort of doubt and its clarification also proves the purposiveness of the Adhikarana.

Still this does not raise any objection against Ananda-mayadhikarana. And to do so we presented the discussion as before. The apparant objection raised against, Prana that is, to have its samanvaya in Vishnu, is deeper in meaning than that this Prayojana or purpose is here justified.

Now an objection is raised: the Purvapakshi contends that the present Adhikarana has nothing new. The previous Adhikarana अतःएव प्राणः has exhaustively treated the Samanvaya of प्राण in Vishnu. Hence प्राणः त चानुगमात् has nothing new in it. Many differences and distinctions between the topics of the two Adhikaranas are brought to light to justify the separate existence of these Adhikaranas, But they were found untenable. In course of exhibition of such distinctions it is argued that in the previous Adhikarana, Purvapaksha is based upon Shruti depending upon wide publicity and Sidhanta is arrived at, by means of Lingas like 'husband of Lakshmi'; while here Purvapaksha is based upon Lingas which corroborate the connotation of Prana and the Sidhanta is concluded on the virtue of Brahma Shruti and the Lingas like 'gods being guided'

But this argument does not stand the test. For Purvapaksha based on Shruti which is contradicted by mere Linga and which again is rebutted by hostile Shruti and Lingas cannot be revived by mere Lingas you cannot counter argue by saying that numerous Shruties would revive what

is contradicted. For what is based on numerality of Shruties is contradicted in the Gayatri Adhikarana.

But in Gayatri Adhikarana the Shruties like स एष स एष भूः and others have different topics. Here in this Adhikarana and in the Shruti चक्षुःश्रोत्रं मनः.....स एष प्राणः only one Prana Shruti is repeated. Yet this does not add any strength to the argument. For even in Gayatri Adhikarana गायत्रीवा इदं सर्वं is noted there.

But in Gayatri Adhikarana Purvapaksha based on the repetition of Shruti is not contradicted. It is contradicted only in Akashadhikarana. Otherwise there would be the fault of tautology. But quotations from Bhasya and Sudha would prove that there is no tautology in Gayatri Adhikarana. And in Akashadhikarana also there would be no tautology. For in that Adhikarana Akasha Shruti only that supplies the topical sentence is being repeated.

Revival is not possible only by numerality of Shruties and Lingas. For though there is multiplicity of Shruties and Lingas, in Indra, like इन्द्रस्पृप्रियं धाम and Lingas like महाव्रतयोजित्व, in Mukhya Prana, multiplicity of Shruties like प्राणादि and Lingas like Prana Samvada and in jeeva, multiplicity of Struties like पुरुषरूपेण य एष तपति and Lingas like सतसंवत्सरत्वादि - still all these three types of shruties have scope of reference else where and Lingas also can be induced to adjust themselves to the reference of Vishnu. Hence they cannot contradict multiplicity of Shruties referring to Vishnu or Brahma which is known to refer to Vishnu.

Here Chandrikakara Cites an instance from Jaimini. Sutrās. In the fourth Adhyaya, fourth Pada and eleventh

Adhikarana, a doubt arises whether in Darsha and Purnamasa all Yagas are to be considered important or only Agneyadi in their allotted time are to be considered important, Prayaja and others are to be considered subordinate. Then Purvapaksha or Prima facie view is that Yagas with reference to Darsha and Purnamasa are to be settled by the predicate (आख्यात) used in the injunction दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां स्वर्गं कामो यजेत । and the predicate refers in general to all yagas that have been mentioned without any distinction, resulting in the final objective. Hence all the yagas are important. But the Names of unknown publicity, of course, depend upon the predicate. Those of known publicity are free. Hence only six yagas are important. Because Darsha and Purnamasa refer to only six yagas with their allotted time on the strength of the words of the learned. Though the word yaga is a general term yet the two names, each name mentioning three lead them to the restricted meaning of six yagas, which are the only important yagas. Here the stem and the termination have an important meaning and the predicate itself is dependent on the name. Hence the six yagas are important; Samit and others depend upon them. This is the Sidhanta.

In the same manner just as यज्ञ according to the names of दर्श and पूर्णमास in the statement of the wise refers only to those six yagas or just as according to Indra shruties the marks of 'the leader of अप्' refer to Vishnu, so also (ब्रह्मशब्दः परेऽविष्णौ) according to the word ब्रह्म the marks 'Prana samvada' and others can be easily led to refer to Vishnu. Hence they do not help Purvapaksha to rise.

If this is not accepted, as in Rajasuyayaga, all the yagas that are present shall have to be accepted. Now there are Anumati and videvana and others are yagas and non-yagas, Regarding these it is said राजा राजसूयेन स्वराज्यकामो यजेत then a doubt arises whether Anumati and Videvana, yagas and non-yagas are both important with reference to the final result (फल) or only yagas are important. Now though Rajasuya is not familiarly known yet as it is used in the instrumental, it is known to be the means to the end; and with yagas and non-yagas they are known with their names to have some fruit at the end. Besides यज् reminds us of these by the rule of 'Those who hold umbrella go (including those who do not hold umbrella). Hence that yagas are important is the Purvapaksha.

Even then it is only the root meaning that is connected with the result-meaning (फल) and the name-meaning is not so connected. While the root यज् means unqualified yaga and Rajasuya yaga in apposition to those yagas means 'those yagas which thus are easily connected with the result, and are the important ones and not all.

Now in the present case these are shruties which contain words like Brahman which refer to Vishnu. It cannot be presumed that the Purvapakshi connives at the Vishnu shruties which are in the unavoidable proximity of the Indra shruties. It is already in the Anandamayadhikarana that Brahman primarily refers to Vishnu.

But there is scope for Purvapakshi to raise an objection because the significant marks of Indra (killer of Vritra) cannot easily be made to refer to Vishnu. If you try to

reconcile them with Brahman pleading that those marks refer to him as immanent (in Indra); then this leads to ridiculous absurdity. Brahman being immanent will be liable to be miserable also as misery is attributed to Indra and others.

Vishnu shruties containing the word Brahman can be made to refer to Indra only secondarily. For Brahman means perfect and Indra will be relatively perfect to his inferiors.

Here Raghavendra notes an objection raised : whether one particular Prana is made to refer to Indra in Purva-paksha or some one indeterminate Prana or all Pranas, Among these three alternatives the first is not justified; when there are many suggestions one particular cannot be chosen as determinate. In the second alternative, if that Prana is not determined then the prime Facie view is doubtful and not decisive. The third alternative is an equal failure. For the statement referring to many will be a divided or disintegrated sentence which is a defect of composition.

This objection is refuted by stating that the marks and Shruties referring to Indra supersede the marks referring to Prana. Besides Indra is the presiding deity over 'hand', hence he is one of the senses given (kinaesthetic sense) to movements. So it is natural for him to pick up a quarrel with them. In the same manner 'Life of hundred years' can be adjusted to refer to Indra some how. So we can definitely state that Indra is Prana. Or he may be Mukhya Prana. For at the beginning and at the end we find his mark mentioned. Now Prana Shruti is well known to refer

to Mukhya Prana and on the strength of the fact the shruties dedicated to Indra can some how be made to refer to Mukhya Prana. Or let that Prana be an Ordinary Soul or jeeva. 'Life of hundred years' is the strong point in his case. This soul being the claimant of the fruit of all the activities of the senses, can be referred to even by the neighbouring Shruties.

HENCE INDRA-SHRUTIES ALSO CAN BE MADE TO REFER TO JEEVA

The second alternative also is just. For references to others, are strong and clear as shown already, and they may be definite as 'other than Vishnu'. or even the third alternative will do. As there are indicators of all the three all the three are primarily and wholly referred to. or some of them may refer to Jeeva, some to Indra and some to Mukhyaprana, partly. This will not amount to division in a sentence. For it may be accepted as a necessary evil. Hence the third alternative only may be accepted as Purva paksha.

If the third alternative is acceptable many will rise up to be Purvapaksha; then Indra and others may be doubted to be identical with Vishnu or not; and then the doubt might be cleared. Thus there will be no fault of division of a sentence.

But this sort of Purvapaksha is not warranted. For the wording of the Sutra does not refer to difference or Bhada. In the Antaradhikarna only identity with Indra and others is clearly refuted. And as shown before are strong indicators of others. Thus the Purvapaksha (as shown by us) is justified on very grounds of exclusive marks and references.

But again an objection is raised. In Akashadhikarana in आकाश इति होवाच, आकाश is physical sky; then even in यदेष आकाश also, where आकाश is ascertained to be Brahman as it occurs in a Brahma Prakarana. आकाश means, 'the other' in the Purvapaksha. Then why should it not be here ? we do admit the first statement but not what you derive from it. For in the previous Prandhikarana the Purva paksha is different from that of this Adhikarana (अस्य प्राणाधिकारण). The special reason for Prana, not to be Vishnu is absent in the previous Pranadhikarana; and hence according to the rule of Shidhanta, Prana justly refers to Vishnu.

This is not a good argument; for injunction स्वर्गकामो यजेत being a statement yielding fruit, enjoins the next elderly pereon (य योज्य) who entertains the desire (of getting heaven). Hence लिङ् the termination in यजेत means 'the अपूर्व is fit to be gained' (which रयामी exists till heaven is gained). But in such injunctions as अहरहः संयाम्पासीत the Sandhya is a daily routine without entailing any kama or fruit. Hence the लिङ् does not involve any syntactical relationship with the Niyojya. Still the meaning once settled some where holds good in another place also. So in the second case also लिङ् means 'the अपूर्व is possible to be gained' (This is according to the system of Prabhakara) According to Bhattamata on the remaining part of a sentence, the यव comes to mean दर्शनक and it is universally extended to other places also. In the same manner from the marks of Indra, Prana refers to Indra previously So also तद्वैवप्राणः the Prana refers to Indra

Here Raghadra introduces some objection. Even the rule that a meaning once settled somewhere holds universally good, does not serve the purpose. Just as in ऐतरेयक there are the indicators of vayu and others and hence it is said to mean all the three; so also there are the marks of Vishnu and hence it refers to Vishnu. There in Antaradhi-karana as identity was refuted, so Vishnu and Indra cannot be identical. Yet in the instances shown in the IV Pada (अव्यक्तात्पुरुषः) the primary meaning was accepted to be Vishnu while subordinate meaning was accepted something else. Other wise it would not be possible to settle the scale of gradation.

So here also let the primary meaning be Vishnu and the subordinate meaning Indra. And the marks of Indra will thus be justified. So also in the previous Adhikarana also primarily it refers to Vishnu. In the same way the mark of Indra being strong primarily refers to Indra and subordinately to Vishnu. As well in the previous Adhikarana they refer to Vishnu subordinately.

Or as there are indicators of both equally well they refer to both primarily in the ऐतरेयक in the previous sutra also let it refer to both. But this manifold object is not possible and hence they are refuted one by one. And the purpose is justified. At last it is concluded that the Purva-paksha rises in sound health.

Thus by means of exclusive marks and others Purva-paksha is raised. And by more powerful exclusive marks of Vishnu in overwhelming number, Sidhanta rises up. Many strange qualitative attributes are heard about Prana.

Gods preached about prana (देवोपदेश्यत्वम्). Gods contemplated on prana as Bhuti. Prana is said to be propounded by the Vedas (सर्ववेदप्रातिपाद्य). And Prana is said to be seated in the orb of the sun; and many others. These are the strong and exclusive marks of Vishnu. These marks are derived both from Saruti and Smriti

But it was argued that even marks of Purvaparksha were exclusive. So शास्त्र दृष्ट्यानु is made available here to refute this contention. तामिदं उवाच प्राणो वा अहमस्मिन्कृपे. Here the word Indra depending upon populer usage may mean Indra. But the word अहं used to refer to Indra does not refer to him but to Vishnu who is immanent in Indra as in अहमनु. used by vamadeva. Just as in मंचाः क्रीडति, Mancha refers to men on the Mancha by almost popular use without any special purpose; so also by implication अहं refers to one inside Indra and not to Indra. For smriti-recognises this सर्वांतर्यामिको विष्णुः Hence he is Vishnu in the Primary sense also.

If reference to the immanent is not accepted, then we are forced to accept identity of Vamadeva with Manu. Now is this identity of two mere chetanas without any attributes or is that the identity of two qualified souls But it cannot be the identity of two qualified souls Manu and Vamadeva. For Vamadeva cannot be Manu.

Now again if mere two chetanas are said to be identified, then from this illustration we should go to the illustrated where Indra says 'I am prana' अहं प्राण, अन्वयम्) This means that Indra is Prana. Does this Indra mean qualified soul Indra or naked conscience or chetana merely. In the first

alternative differently qualified objects are not accepted as identical. Hence qualified Indra cannot be identical with Prana. A soul with clear attributions of Indra cannot be one with all things. In the second alternative the Purvapakshi who contends that Prana is not Brahma cannot reasonably do so as Prana is pure or unqualified Brahma.

Though the word अहं is shown to refer to Brahma through derivation in the upanishads (अहेयत्वाद् अहं) not fit to be condemned), Still here in प्राणोवाहमस्मि ऋषे, अहं is used in the first person (as pronoun). So here Vishnu's immanence is accepted; and Indra is said to be Prana because the immanent Vishnu in Indra is called Prana, when there is certainty that in Prana Vishnu is there and not any one else we need not take into consideration any auxiliary evidences. Jaimini also recommends auxiliary evidences only when there is doubt (विशये प्राय दर्शनात्). Here the invariable and exclusive marks as shown before prove prana to be Vishnu.

But Vishnu is known to be indifferently disposed, when the conversation was going on. Then how can the agency of partnership in the conversation be attributed to the immanent Vishnu? Prana Samvada is justified in Vishnu because he is said to be one who lifts them up, and who rules over all Others are his servants and he is the supreme Lord. Thus in order to exhibit his undisputed supremacy and sovereignty he enters into them and makes conversation with them.

Here Bhagavata is quoted. There it is stated that 'both Keshava and (four faced) Brahma are said to be indifferent.'

indifference or औदासीन्य means sleep or सुप्ति. So Antaryami cannot be active.

But this औदासीन्य is in respect of some outward and not immanent form of Vishnu. How is it that Bramha (four faced) is said to be indifferent in holding up his own body? For when Prana migrates Bramha is not able to hold the body and Vice Versa. But this is not a fact. While migrating the body Bramha selects there in part and in part quits the body with Prana and with Vishnu. When these three have departed no one is able to raise the body of Bramha. Then all the three entered the body which then stood up erect.

Misery is not compatible with the immanent Vishnu. In the same manner the stay of Prana in the body of Jeeva is not a mark of Jeeva. 'Therefore men live for hundred years.' This life of hundred years depending upon the stay of Prana is mark of Jeeva. That is not stated to be in Prana.

Therefore what has been expatiated upon so long may be summed up that the Purva Paksha was formed depending upon the exclusive nature of marks of others and Sidhanta concluded depending upon the exclusive nature of the marks of Vishnu and reference to Vishnu of other marks. This much is corroborated by quoting direct sentences of Acharya.

The sequence of the Sutras— In अतः एवप्राणः the first Sutra, the reason (अतः) is adduced in favour of Sidhanti and Purvapaksha had been raised on the basis of exclusive Shruties. So doubting the applicability of Shruties to

some what else, on the strength of the mark 'Vanquisher of Vritra' the Shruti was revived to denote Indra.

Now the Hetu is made clear. Just as Prana in तन्वैत्वं प्राणः refers to Vishnu. So also here Prana means Vishnu. ब्रह्मोमपुरुष is the Shruti; and mark is the object of worship by Gods. And these have been repeated in many contexts.

In the second Sutra प्राणस्तथानुगमात् the shruti quoted is प्राणो वाहं and the contradiction that arises due to the use of अहं with reference to Indra is removed. In अध्यात्मसंबन्ध भूमा, the word अध्यात्म means body. Indra and Vishwamitra are considered the body of Bhagavan who thus comes in contact with many Atmas. This is the meaning of अध्यात्मसंबन्ध भूमा. Then अस्मिन् means in this context (प्रकरणे). Because Bhagavan is in Indra, Indra says 'I am Prana'. If Prana were not Vishnu then it would have been told in this very Prakarana that प्राणःत्वम् प्राणः सर्वाणि भूतानि) Vishnu is in all places and hence it is possible that 'you are Prana'. Now it is clear that it is not cogent to call Viswamitra to be Prana, as in Purvapaksha. In Aitareya Bhashya it is stated that "In Indra there is known to be 'impregnated Presence' of (आवेश) Vishnu, by the use of the word (अध्यात्म संबंध भूमाह्मस्मिन्. In other places Bhagavan is immanent. This special Presence in Indra is only temporary. Hence Indra says that he is Prana.

Raghavandra quotes the whole of it for greater enlightenment. "Then Indra being possessed of Vishnu and vayu sat before Kausika. 'This is thy food' he said and recited thousand hymns as a part of Sacrifice. Hearing this Keshava

along with Vayu was quite satisfied. Then Janardana asked him to tell for the second time. Then Vishwamitra possessing Indra told it for his satisfaction. Because he was very dear to him Bhagavan asked Kausika to tell him that it was Vishnu's food. Bhagavan was very much pleased and granted him salokya (Being in the same world of Vishnu) as the first award. As second he granted him his close vicinity. When he said he would grant him the third boon, the sage said to Janardana "Let me know you only perfectly". Thus desirous of happiness of supreme quality as in Moksha, he in the body of Indra along with vayu declared that 'he alone is called by all names'. "This knowledge of mine is the best one. For I shall be proved to possess all perfections only when I am called by all names."

In the third (शास्त्रदृष्ट्या वामदेवत्) if the statement 'I am prana' is justified on the strength of the clarification that Vishnu is in him, then 'God in the chariot' and 'In me there is Prana" would be similar. This is harmful. The suggested harm is removed by the words in the Sutra.

In this Sutra (शास्त्र) means Brahman as he is the ruler (शास्त्र) of all. Hence he is called by the respective names.

Then in the fourth Sutra (जीवमुख्य प्राणलिगात्) Raghavendra institutes an objection to what has been proved. The marks of the conversation of Prana cannot refer to the immanent Prana. For then immanent is found to be indifferent (sleeping) to what was happening round about. But if that is so there is no purpose to serve. Therefore it is stated in Teeka that he was like an indifferent one. The explanation is that indifference was in respect of an outside

form. But there is some purpose. For upasana or meditative worship is of three Kinds-1) In ward 2) out ward and 3) ubiquitous. and the purpose is to meditate and worship according to one of these types.

But others quote here Kaucheetakee Brahmana in which there is the story of Indra and Pratardana- (मामेवविजानीहि) 'Tly to understand me' Beginning thus he says further प्राणोस्मि प्रज्ञात्मा. Now the question is what is Prana. is Prana vayu or Indra, or Jeeva or Brahma? Taking into consideration the popular notion in this context Prana means vayu. This is only Prima facie view. The real fact is Prana, is Brahma, as he is attributed to possess 'benefaction of the highest order' 'Imperviousness to such heinous sins as theft and killing an embryo (causing abortion) and to possess such merits as essential consciousness and bliss. vayu cannot claim these merits.

But Indra himself declares that he is Prana and hence Indra might be declared Prana. So he is not Brahma. Then this objection is refuted by the second and the third Sutra by stating that Prana is said to reside in the body as long as it is alive. Again Prana is blessed with essential consciousness and bliss. Besides he is attributed to be inner most Atma which is incompatible with Indra living outside. Prana advises that one should think him to be Prana in the same manner as Brahman advises that one should think him to be Brahma. This statement of Indra to be himself Prana is justified as the statement of Vamadeva to be Manu.

Then in the fourth Sutra 'नवाचं विजिज्ञासीत वक्तारं विद्यात्' The mark of being a speaker which is the characteristic of

Jeeva is mentioned. In अथप्राण एव इदंशरीरं परिग्रह्य उत्थापयति vayu Linga has been stated. हिततमत्वं is Brahma Linga. Hence all these three are claimants for being worshipped. So Brahma is not the claimant. This is the objection side. But the Sidhanta is that as there are Brahman Lingas in respect of Prana in whom attributes of Brahman are found, the other Lingas also can be easily made to refer to Brahman. This state has been made following Shankara Bhashya as it is. But Bhamati makes an amended statement. He states that the hostile Purvapaksha does not arise at all. For though embodiedness fits in with vayu yet the activities of vayu are under the control of Paramatma. And speech making the function of one having the faculty of speaking, fits in with Jeeva and the marks of Indra might easily be adjusted with Brahma. Now Prana of the nature of consciousness is said to fit the object of worship. And with this very Prana, the one of the nature of consciousness is said to emerge from the body. But in Brahman that is integral and one without difference, dual number and Co-existence and emergence are incongruent with its nature. So the three vayu and others only are the objects of worship whenever each one of them is found suitable. Disunity in a statement can be borne and thus there is scope for Purva paksha. Sidhanta, of course is based upon unity in the statement as said before.

Before the interpretation of the Sutra is critically reviewed here the reason adduced to uphold the Sidhanta by others is criticised. According to Bhamatikara Supreme benefaction is said to be a mark of Brahman. Now is This benefaction of the highest order a means to the human end or is it the end itself.

In the first alternative this sort of benefaction is not to be found in Brahman. For in his system it is Jnana or Knowledge which dispels ignorance. This dispelling of ignorance is the coveted end of human life; and that is achieved through Knowledge. Now in the second alternative हिततमत्वं or highest benefaction is the end of life. Then हिततमत्वं is nothing but pure consciousness compatible with the state of redemption immune from all turmoil. First it should be decided whether Prana would be determined in Sidhanta as विशिष्ट or बृद्ध. It cannot be the former; for it is clouded with ignorance. Then in the latter case is it to a Jeeva in his circulation period that pure Brahman is हिततम or is it to a pure and released soul? Brahman's beneficence cannot be to a qualified soul. For a qualified soul has no existence in the released condition. Nor can his beneficence be to a pure soul; because the pure soul is partless; hence we cannot say that this part is beneficial to him. The very expression 'involves a dividing difference between the two pure souls which is impossible. Besides this Adhikarana is dedicated to establish Brahman by condemning Jeeva. Hence this cannot posit any unity or oneness between them. Hence the Advaitin cannot at all begin this Adhikarana consistently, as that leads to self contradiction.

Now Chandrikakara reviews critically Ramanuja's argument and interpretation of this Adhikarana. According to him in Pratardana Vidya 'सामुपात्त' is the Linga of Indra. For he is announced by words like Indra and Prana. No doubt there are marks of the Jeevas, which may be easily made to refer to Indra who is a special type of man

Besides there are exclusive marks of Indra like 'the killer of Twastri' "Blissfulness and absence of oldage" in the light of "Killer of Twastri" should be led to connote Indra only.

Yet, Ramanuja says, on account of numberless attributes of Paramatman being mentioned like-Bliss, absence of oldage, and death, Benefaction, Prompter of good and evil, unfailing support to both sentient and insentient-these and many other attributes find their fulfilment when Paramatma immanent in Indra is worshipped with these. Hence Indra directs to worship him, attributing these qualities to him. This also proves that Indra or Prana mentioned with these attributes is different from Jeeva. This according to Ramanuja is the Sidhanta.

But in Ramanuja Bhashya doubt is expressed in the form whether one, called by the name Prana, is a Jeeva or Paramatma; Indra is not one of the alternatives of the doubt. Still because it is stated that Indra is a famous Jeeva-and it is also elucidated to that effect in Shruta Prakishika,-Indra is Prana.

But chandrikakara contends that the Purvapaksha is not in conformity with the wording of the Sutra. If the contention of Purvapaksha is that Prana is Indra, then in the Sutra, the doubt cannot assume the form 'because there is the mark of Jeeva and Mukhya Prana'. Even then he may persist that Jeeva means a special type of Jeeva who is Indra yet Sutra could not have stated मुख्य प्राणलिङ्गात् Mukhya prana) For in his system Mukhyaprana is insentient and hence Indra cannot be a special form of vayu. A common word of general application when it has a special meaning shall have to assume secondary implication. Another

logical fault is exposed. According to Ramanuja **मामुपास्व** refers to Indra who asks us to worship him. So he has accepted agency of speaking as a mark of Jeeva. This very Sutra may also include **आत्मोपदेश** as a mark of Jeeva, hence of Indra; So **नवक्तुः आत्मोपदेशात्** is futile. This defect includes many more. If Prana is made an adjective of Indra then it is degraded to be Subordinate. This runs counter to the Sutra arrangement where it is used (**प्राणः तथानुगमात्**) a धर्मो one possessing attribute, as predominant word. It would have been, **इन्द्रस्तथानुगमात्**.

But the Shruti Prakasha a commentary on Ramanuja Bhashya defends the use of Prana in the Sutra thus. The word Prana is used in a sentence which describes Paramatma and hence it adduces a reason to prove Sidhanta and it is used in the Sutra, as a substantive. This is not fair and correct. For the reason for Sidhanta is already supplied by **तथानुगमात्** and the reason for Purvapaksha is not expressed by any word and hence to fill up that gap and being the predominant one Indra alone is fit to be used in the Sutra. Therefore it is stated in his Bhashya 'the word Indra is popularly known to be a special Jeeva'. So you should suppose that the reason of Purvapaksha is stated out side only.

This very objection can be raised against the Advaitins. For they also, with this very Shruti, have raised the Purvapaksha in favour of Jeeva, Indra. and Mukhya Prana. But this can not be flung in our face. For we have cited the shruti which is not touched with the fault shown before. The life of hundred years is the

mark of Jeeva and it does not fit in with Indra, who is immortal and hence Cannot be said to live for hundred years. while in Ramanuja's interpretation, the mark of Jeeva is said to be agency of speech which can be easily acquiesced in being the mark of Indra who is a special form of Jeeva. while our Jeeva mark cannot be so acquiesced in Indra. There fore Jeeva independently by itself can be the reasonable subject of Purvapaksha. Prana too not as an adjunct to something, but as an independent substantive is also fit to be the subject of Purvapaksha. Hence our interpretation is free from all such blemishes.

Thus critically reviewing the interpretation by others, of the Adhikarana and the first sutra in the usual course, he takes up, for review. वक्तु आत्मोपदेशत् as interpreted by others means "the speaker Indra is meant by Prana, for Indra refers to himself (आत्मोपदेशत्) that he is Prana (प्राणोऽस्मि) (this is Purvapaksha). This is not sound. For in this chapter the period of life, the agency of speech, the nature of consciousness are attributed to Prana which are the suitable attributes of the inner self. They do not conform to the out side Indra "

This interpretation is not the correct one. For आत्मोपदेशत् itself involves उपदेष्टृत्व (agency of speech) which is वक्तृत्व or agency of speech. Hence the use of वक्तृत्व separately again is redundant (वक्तुः). Besides वक्तुः 'does not even bring the sense of 'reference to oneself' (आत्मोपदेश). But our slate is clean. वक्ता is not Indra as you consider. He is Viswamitra, who is the reciter of Brahatee sahasra

and Indra can never try to deceive the reciter of Brahatee sahasra. This only strengthens the Purvapaksha view.

Now their Sidhanta also is refuted. For Indra has his body and has power of speech and nature of consciousness while limited life and power of speech are found only in Jeeva and vayu. These are not found in Brahma who is bereft of senses and is eternal and found every where. Hence this goes against the Sidhanta which upholds Brahma to be Prana. अत्मोपदेशत्व is not explained by seeking the services of अत्यर्यामित्व or immanence as we have done. Hence they cannot prove that the chapter under consideration has Brahman for its subject which cannot be set aside.

Now the third sutra शास्त्रदुष्ट्या तूपदेशोऽमदेववत् is interpreted by the Advaitin as follows. Indra, through an investigation of shastras realises that he is Brahman, preached that they should know him fully just as Vamadeva did. Vamadev realised that he was Manu and Surya. Aham is a complex psychosis of both sentient and insentient; and hence it is not possible to find the essence of Brahma (ब्रह्मत्व) or the essence of Manu and others. The realised knowledge that I am Brahma which is the reason for the statement that 'know me only' or 'I am Manu' is an erroneous knowledge and hence it might not have been warranted by the shastras.

A clarification is sought at the hands of Advaitin and it is this :- Indra is illustrated by an instance of Vamadeva. And in reference to these two (अहं) is used. The reason for the statement of "know me only" and such others is the knowledge of identity of Brahma and Manu with qualified

Aham(अहं) expressed by the word Prana or is it merely the knowledge of identity of pure consciousness with Pure consciousness by Lakshana that is the reason for the statement ?

Now in the case of the first alternative, Aham (अहं), or I which means the complex psychosis of Sentient and insentient does not involve or include either Brahmatva or Manvaditva the reason for the statement 'know me only' I am the manu's is a stated before erroneous knowledge and it cannot be resultant of the study of shastras. In the second alternative if it is merely the knowledge of identity of pure consciousness with pure consciousness, the objects of knowledge are different. For the two have 'I' for the object of knowledge (know me only; I am manu) They ought to be 'know pure consciousness' 'pure consciousness is, Manu and other's. If it is contended that 'me and I' mean by secondary implication 'pure consciousness'; that pure consciousness which is neither subject nor object has none of the Karaka functions (of either subject or object) and hence cannot stoop down to be object of knowledge. A nice distinction is sought by stating that pure consciousness allows itself to be known as the subject (अहंलेखितम्) or object and does not actually become the object. But grammar rule does not allow such distinctions. For if it is to get the accusative termination (कर्मणिद्वितीया), it must actually become the object while on our side the 'I' used by us, is said to have primary meaning only with reference to the immanent. Hence no such difficulties arise.

Now about the word shastra in the sutra, by derivation only it means the immanent and by convention it means

shastras like vada and others. It is a rule that between yoga and Rudhi, Rudhi is preferred to yoga. So sastra by Rudhi or convention means veda and others and not the immanent by yoga. Shashtra means veda and others by yoga only. For the vedas enjoin a duty which conduces to our happiness; while they prohibit us from doing a bad deed because that causes evil. Thus enjoining, the vedas are called shastras by yoga or causes evil. Thus enjoining, the vedas are called shaslras by yoga or derivative mode, and not by Rudhi. So where a word by its constituent parts yields a meaning then there is yoga; where the parts do not yield any meaning and only the whole word has some meaning then it is convention.

Even if we admit yoga in both the places, still what is the reason for accepting the meaning of 'the immanent'? If that meaning is not accepted what absurdities, contradictions would arise, has already been shown. Now one more reason is adduced here. There is a shruti to the effect that there is only one shasta or chief comptroller who is Brahman and there is no second to him. For the cause of application is amply found in Brahman only. The word shashtra is found used in the sense Brahman. (सवित् शास्त्रं परपदं). Shaslra by Rudhi does not mean vedas.

Again there is advantage to the side of immanence while there is disadvantage to the side of identity. For Indra becomes able to enjoin us to see him only when he realises identity with Brahman, through the knowledge acquired by the study of the shastras. So this is slow work through some medium while ours is immediate work. For directly referring to the immanent form we announce that I am

Prana. But the Advaitin contends that he takes recourse to the realisation of indentity on the strength of the in stance that is quoted वामदेववत् (अहंमनुरभवम्). Vamadeva realises oneness with manu on the strength of the identity of all with Brahman. But this identity will not be possible as it is between Brahman or manu with 'I' the qualified.

Some again contend that one is enjoined to worship as with consciousness, with material nature, and in his own nature. (उपासात्रैविध्यम्). This will not lead to disunity in (वाक्यभेद) composition or in a sentence. For in one sentence it is enjoined that one with life, with vitality and in his nature should be worshipped. But this is in conformity with Upanishadic injunction that Prana is to be worshipped. For Prana is represented here as insentient or material. But Prana is not insentient. It is chetana or sentient so the types of worship are limited only to two.

Now this also silences the contention of some others who argue that प्राणोवास्मि प्रज्ञात्मा तं माम्मायुरमृतमिह्युपास्ते is an Indra propounding statement. Hence it is natural that Indra is declared to be the object of worship. Now who is this Indra ? Is he god Indra or Shiva ? Then the prima facie view is that Indra is one who protects the world with rain (and food); and he is also endowed with wealth in abundance. Therefore Prana is obviously god Indra, who is fit to be the univesal object of worship. Now the marks of Jeeva aequiesces in Indra as he is a super type of man. In the same manner even the marks of Prana can easily by the attributes of Indra. Hence Indra in preference to Jeeva and Prana or vayu can be Prana.

Now Sidhanta is that absence of oldage and death and such other marks persistently follow and are found at the end, So that Shiva is conclusively proved to be Prana. But this stands contradicted and confuted.

For if Indra alone is the Purvapaksha, Sutrakara would not have mentioned Jeeva and Mukhya Prana as the object of doubt. Again as Jeeva refers to Indra for he is a special type of Jeeva and the speaker referring to himself is the mark of Indra and is already included in this, the sutra नववतुरात्मोपदेशात् need not be separately framed. If Prana were an adjective qualifying Indra, then Prana can not be introduced as an independent Substantive. That prana is Vishnu has been already proved in Pranadhikarana. Immoratlity and immunity from oldage are the attributes of Vishnu. But in the case of Shiva 'हृद्रस्य शिर उत्पिपेष' 'there is the reference to the breaking of his head'. and this is not compatible with his immortality.

Ramanujiya's interpretation also of न वक्तुः is proved equally untenable. For it is said in shivarkamani deepika Aitaraya that ('प्राणः त्वं; प्राणः सर्वाणि भूतानि') the mark of being the Atma of ail belongs to Brahma; and hence Prana is Brahma, undoubtedly. But in प्राणोस्मि प्रज्ञात्मा there is the killing of Twastru, the mark of Indra; and in शरीरं परिगृह्य there is the mark of Prana Thus there is difference.

This is foolish prattle. As there, so here, also there are many marks of Brahma. If there, it was Brahma, it was so on the strength of this rule only and not otherwise. For many exclusive marks of Indra are seen there. And when that rule is cited, the Purvapaksha of three alternatives

as mentioned in the Sutra is said to be justified. The cause of doubt is as mentioned in the Tattvaparakashika. At the end of the Adhikarana it is said in Teeka “नहिमहि दासोमृनितयोच्यते वैयर्थ्यात् that Mahidasa is not mentioned as a sage uselessly. The word वैयर्थ्य cannot then be justified. For had Mahidasa been a Riski only he would not have been able to give divine posts to gods and to sustain those gods. These attributes of Brahman had been mentioned for seaker to worship Brahman with those attributes. All this would have been futile. Or let Mahidas be mentioned also as Brahmsn otherwise he would not be able to assign divine posts and to sustain those gods.

Chandrikakara at the end of the first pada gives a beautiful argument epitomising the whole in a nutshell. The first five Adhikaranas treat Samanvaya in a general and not particular way. And hence the whole set cannot be included in the Adhyaya and had to remain outside it as introduction to it. There also, the first Adhikarana is an introduction to the whole of shastra or discipline of Brahman; while the other four are included in the shastra and yet are introductory to the Adhyaya. Thus the first five form one group. Beginning from Anandamaya to the end of the first pada the sutras form one big group as Samanvaya is treated there in. Even there Anandamaya and Antasthatva Abhikaranas form a small internal group; because they both deal in many prima facie views on many topics. Then the four Adhikaranas beginning from Antaradikarana (Antah, Akasha, Prana, and Jyoti) form a separate group as they deal with objections raised against the conclusions of Anadamaya. Even here, three Adhikaranas

beginning from Akasha (Akasha, Prana and Jyoti) form an internal group as they extend the application of the Nayas in Antardhikarana, to these Adhikaranas and they deal in Bhuta names.

To be brief the topic of the Pada is the Samanvaya of the common words connoting mostly gods, elemental objects, and bodies, and all words in the vedas referring them to the particular hymns where they occur, and to marks mentioned.

End of the first Pada

BHASHYA :

In this Pada attributive words which are the characteristic marks are shown to refer to Vishnu mostly.

Vishnu was said to be ubiquitous (ब्रह्मतत्त्वम्) But that attribute is known to belong to Aditya by such statements as 'ब्रह्मै तस्या वासिष्ठो रसः'.

Therefore (the Sutrakara) said —

सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपदेशात् ॥ १ ॥

(तत्त्वं should be imported). That which is said to reside in all (Earth and others) is Bramha called Narayana; and not any other thing. Because in a thing found every where, the well-known word Brahman is found in the Veda as residing in a thing found every where, known by the name of Narayana In the Shruti

(स य इवायं जगदीशः प्रज्ञात्मा) 'this very person is disembodied and essentially consciousness'. The one that is heard to reside in all beings is Narayan only ! 'That is the only great Brahma accepted by the wise.' 'That is the great Brahma'.

"Who other than Vasudeva might there be connoted primarily by the word Brahma ? For he alone is perfect with attributes; others are so only formally."

So the well-known word Brahma is used (in Shruti) only with reference to him.

विवक्षित गुणोपपत्तेश्च ॥ २ ॥

And because the attributes (like unheardness) in Sarvagata which are fit to refer to him in Shruti or which are going to be mentioned later on, can be meaningfully applied to Vishnu alone and cannot be thus applied to any one else; so the Sarvagata is Vishnu.

BHASHYA :

"That same one is not heard" and others. He is by this mantra "oh Vishnu ! the one god that is already born or is going to be born" the one that is not heard. (अश्रुत) "He is Savita, he is Vayu, he is Indra, he is unheand and unseen, who is Hari, who is the great, who is Vishnu the endless.' thus in chaturvedashikha.

But because the word Aditya is used and because he is said to identify himself with the body endowed with instruments of knowledge like eyes and ears, he (Sarvagata) should not be thought to be 'Jeeva'.

For

अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शरीरः ॥ ३ ॥

Sarvagata is not Jeeva or (Aditya ; because it is not reasonable (to think that one soul can reside in all bodies).

BHASHYA :

For it is not possible for one soul to reside in all bodies,

कर्म कर्तृव्यपदेशात् ॥ ४ ॥

Jeeva is not Sarvagata because Sarvagata mentioned 'Atma' is an object while (आत्मनं परस्मै शंसति) Jeeva, contrary to it, is mentioned as the subject.

शब्दविरोधान् ॥ ५ ॥

In the statement (एतमेव ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते), the word Brahma does not refer to Jeeva; because the word Brahma is qualified by the (विशेषण) attribute (एव).

BHASHYA :

He alone is told to be Brahma. And not Jeeva is called Brahma.

“This Vishnu alone is Brahma; this Vishnu alone is Atma, this Vishnu alone is Savita. That Vishnu alone is called Hari for he takes away (Sins). He is the great and is perfectly great or supreme.” thus it is told in Indra dyumna shaka.

स्मृतेच्य ॥६॥

Not only because there is Shruti to the effect that Brahma is not Jeeva) but also because there is Smriti (to that effect).

“oh the conquerors of sleep ! I am Atma the immanent in the hearts of all.” (Gita 10-20)
 “Descending on the Earth I hold up the souls by my intrinsic strength” (Gita 15-13)

We should not father upon the Sutrakara as his opinion any adventitious and unwarranted statement.

अर्भकीकस्त्वात्तद्वयपदेशाच्च नैतिचेन्न

निचाय्य त्वादेवं व्योमवस्थ ॥७॥

As it (Sarvagati) is said to occupy a small place (in the heart) and as Jeeva is referred to (by Shruti and Ling), Brahma is not sarvagata. If so that is not correct. For (these references agree only with Vishnu) he (Vishnu) is to be meditated upon (with those attributes) thus. (A big thing is contained in a small recipient) like the the sky.

BHASHYA :

As stated in सर्वेषु मूलेषु he is one having a small place (in the hearts); and as stated in चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयः he is said to have Jeeva attributes he (sarvagata) is not Brahma. But this objection is not correct. For Vishnu is to be worshipped with the attributes of अभैकौकस्य and चक्षुर्मयत्व. Again even an ubiquitous entity can be held in a small place like the sky.

Vishnu resides in all beings as the controller of their senses and is called by the names of all and is propounded in all the vedas. Thus in skanda.

संभोगप्राप्तिरिति चेन्न वैशेष्यात् ॥ ८ ॥

(If sarvagata (Brahma) is supposed to reside like sky in all the Jeevas) he will be subjected to share the experiences (of pleasure or pain) of those Jeevas. In the face of this serious objection sarvagata cannot be Brahma. But this objection is not tenable. For Vishnu (Brahma) is gifted with extraordinary power; and by the virtue of it he is immune from that subjection to similar experience of Jeeva.

BHASHYA :

If Jeeva and Paramatman reside together in a common body Paramatma is subjected to simi-

lar experiences as those of Jeeva. But this is not true. For he is endowed with extraordinary power.

It is stated in Garuda Purana. Similar experience to Paramatma and Jeeva cannot be argued out; for There is catogorical difference between them on account of their little knowledge and all knowledge, their dependence and independence.

BHAVADEEPA :

Raghavendra first declares the topic of this pada to be the Samanvaya of Lingatmaka words in Narayana. Now what is the meaning of लिगात्मक words ? Linga is usually taken to mean exclusive characteristic. Now how can the words be of the nature of 'exclusive characteristic' ? So Raghavendra explains this expression as लिङ्ग धर्मः स आत्मा इव आत्मा प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तत्वाएषां लिगात्मकः; Linga is an attribute which is the nature of the word. Or which is the cause of application (of the word.) There words which are of the nature of attributer which are the cause of applying the words in the particular sence, are called Lingatmaka words.

In the first Pada, all substantives in veda, with the help of attributive marks in the respective sentences were determined to refer to Vishnu alone. But some attributive marks were found to be ambiguous in reference and those are chosen here for discussion and settlement of Samanvaya in Hari.

Here apparently though the Samanvaya of Nama seems to be settled; yet it is the attributive mark whose Samanvaya is discussed in the frame work of Purvapaksha and Sidhenta, and then settled to refer to Vishnu. For instance 'the residence in a small place' is reviewed on the basis of its popularity in the respective places and at last settled to refer to Hari; and it is not names like Aditya that are determined to refer to Hari.

The topic of the first Sutra सबत्रप्रविष्टोपदेशात् is this-the ubiquitous nature (तत्तमम्.) of Brahman is referred to in ब्रह्मतत्तमम्. But this ubiquity is said to belong to Aditya in तस्यै तस्यासावादित्योरसः But the word Brahma which is referred to by तत्तमम् is used in reference to Vishnu alone in many places.

Now if this तत्तमत्व belongs to some one else then Prana who is said to be तत्तम also will be some one else. For ubiquity here is 'residence in the hearts of all. This is अभिकोक्त्व this may apparently seem to be incompatible with तत्तमत्व or व्याप्तत्व with all pervasiveness. For this ubiquity may be found in Adhitya and others in a restricted form.

Even Jeeva can be said to be तत्तम in a restricted sense. Even 'endowed with the sense of sight' also is compatible with Jeevabhava.

Thus Purvapaksha is not particularly Aditya or Jeeva. Had it been so then there would have been doubt whether तत्तम is Aditya or Jeeva. Purvapaksha sticks to the contention that it is other than Vishnu which is determinate and

decisive. On account of the context, being in the same chapter Aditya is Prana. In Vishnu unrestricted ubiquity cannot be compatibly found with 'residence in a very small place'. But in Aditya, residence in a small place does not run counter to his being. Prana For तत्त्वत्वं can be so restricted as to conform to needs of 'residence in a small place'.

Now the Sidhanta begins. One who is said to be the resident of the cavity of the heart is Brahman only (not Adhitya nor Jeeva); because the word Brahman who is known to be found in Prithive and others, is associated with him. Smriti confirms what Shruti has said that he is found in all elements. But this creates a doubt that Brahman is found only in the elements and not in other places. Hence to remove this doubt, in Bhashya, it is stated that Brahman is used in the sense of Narayana corroborating the sense of shruti. So Narayana who is out side also is stated to be in all places which means that he resides also inside the heart of man.

विवक्षितगुणोपपत्तेश्च— Raghavendra explains अतः in लोकोतो श्रुतः. अतः means व्याप्तः; देशतः कालतश्च गुणतश्चापि पूरितः । अतः इत्युच्यते विष्णुः सततोद्यत उच्यते । spatial and temporal pervasiveness and infinity of perfections belong to Vishnu and hence Vishnu is called अतः. He derives it from the root अत् to go continuously'. Similarly अश्रुत means 'not fully heard' and अगत not reached or understood. अमत्तः not conceived or thought and अनत्त means not dependent.

The words in the shruti also are explained. विवक्षित is explained as 'that which is desired to be spoken' But Jaya-

teertha explains it as 'that which is fit to be spoken' Raghavandra's explanation is not in contravention of Jayateertha's. For that which is fit alone is desired to be spoken. But Tattva Pradeepa explains it as तात्पर्यविषयः 'that which is the purport.'

सोऽश्रुतः He is not heard' does not deny his very audibility; but he being infinite is not fully heard. Hence he is said to be अनंत.

अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शारीरः Here शारीरः refers both to Aditya and Jeevas. But in Bhashya जीव is used in singular, in conformity with न शारीरः in the Sutra. Now the Sutra means "Adhitya or Jeeva is not Sarvagata. Embodied Adhitya is not Sarvagata because the word Adhitya is used. Nor the embodied Jeeva is Sarvagata because there are marks of Jeeva. Thus the word should be repeated and construed both with Aditya and Jeeva. So in the sutra शारीर is not used in dual but in singular to give scope for it to be repeated.

तु in the sutra means एव or only and that is further explained as "If another thing were fit to be sarvagata then it would have been so, on the strength of a reason that warrants it. So Jeeva and others being eligible would have claimed sarvagattva. No other is eligible for it, for the reason of incompatibility (अनुपपत्तेः) only. ultimately एवकार (only) means that there is no use of a search for another reason.

For Jeevas collectively cannot claim to be Sarvagata. For such a statement has no use in the present context. If

Jeeva claims it individually then Jeeva will succumb to pains and pleasures inherent in all bodies. So even if Jeeva is eligible for it yet it will not be compatible with its nature.

In order to avoid this unsettled state of enjoyment of Karma the rule of enjoyment of Karma may be referred to. That body which is built on the strength of his Karma becomes the place of his enjoyment of Karma, and not all bodies in which the Jeeva casually resides, as he does in plants and vegetations at the time of transmigration from one body to another.

Raghavendra explains the intermediate stages. After the exit from the body the soul soars to swarga. After the enjoyment of swarga, the soul descends to the earth through clouds and rain to plants and resides there till he enters into the body of his father and through him to his mother. This Jeeva residing in plants is not subjected to the sufferings of those plants. So also Jeeva can reside in all bodies immune to all pleasures and pains inherent in those bodies.

But residing of all Jeevas in all bodies creates chaos in the world of Karma and a distinct assignment of Karma to a particular soul as his, becomes impossible.

But Aditya can claim sarvagataiva as it is agreed to by you. For as functionary deities Aditya resides in all bodies.

But even Aditya is not found in the bodies of higher souls where he has no function of controlling. It is only to control the bodily functions that those functionary deities reside there in the body.

Or this may be interpreted in another way. Brahma has different bodies in different Kalpas. For different Adhityas function in different kalpas as functionary deities.

कर्मकर्तृव्यपदेशात् In the context of Sarvagata the following Shruti is quoted आत्मानं परस्मै शंलति, He tells others about Atma. This Atma is sarvagata and he is introduced as the object of telling (Preaching) and Jeeva is introduced as the agent of telling. And generally in any activity the agent and the object are found different. Here there is no reason to treat this as an exeptional case. Hence Jeeva is not sarvagata.

Why! both the agent and the object can be Jeeva. One Jeeva that is Sarvagata tells about Atma to another Jeeva that is Sarvagats. Then all the Jeevas cannot be Sarvagata. For the object only आत्मानं is said to be sarvagata. And agent is not said to be sarvagata.

All Jeevas need not be sarvagata; only those Jeevas that are not 'Agent' are 'object' and are sarvagata. But this is not possible. For the 'object' Atma is qualified by the adjective चक्षुर्मय which is the mark of Jeeva in general.

सद्विशेषात् It is argued that because the word ब्रह्म is used in the context of sarvagata, hence he is Vishnu. But then अश्रुतत्व is not compatible with the state of Jeeva. Why? Jeeva also is said to be अश्रुत in Geeta. For it is said that one who sees Jeeva similar to Iswara is rarely to be found.

This is refuted. The word Brahma is not used in the seuse of exclusiveness, Raghavendra now explains the sutra. विशेष means विशेषण. The word ब्रह्म is not used in the sense of Jeeva. For the word is only used in the sense of exclusive

ness. Raghavendra now explains the Sutra. विशेष विशेषण The word Brahma in the exclusive sense (is used) For एतमेवब्रह्मेत्या चक्षते corroborates the view that ब्रह्म is used in the sense of Brahma exclusively and not in the sense of Jeeva. In एतमेव, एव excludes reference of any one but this (real or principal Brahma) It is but a rule that एवकार or 'only' grammatically connected with the subject (उद्देश्य) asserts the exclusive meaning of the Predicate (विधेय). Now in the Sentence एतमेवब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते the subject एतम् connected with एव asserts that predicate ब्रह्म is used in the exclusive sense. In this context if ब्रह्म is used in one of the unimportant meanings namely Jeeva, then other unimportant meanings like Jati or universals also are applicable to Brahma. Hence exclusiveness lent by एवकार is spoiled. But if Brahma is used in the important sense of Vishnu as there is no other important sense Brahma is used in the exclusive sense

In the same manner अभ्रुतत्व and others are used in the exclusive sense only. The previously quoted shruti corroborates this fact. The Geeta statement श्रुत्वाप्येतन्वेदनंचैवकश्चित् also refers to God or Iswara, as stated in Geeta Tatparya. Because already a reference is made to him in अव्यक्तोऽय अचित्तोऽय Even if it refers to Jeeva who is the eternal reflection of Brahma it means to state that when the image is so difficult to be seen much more so its original Brahma; and that its power and strength are beyond description. Hence अभ्रुतत्व and others (Beyond hearing and seeing are chiefly applicable to Iswara only.

स्मृतेष्व Here sutrakara quotes Geeta in order to corroborate the sarvagatatva of Vishnu. No doubt Badarayana and vyasa are one and the same. Yet Gita is conversation between Krishna and Arjuna; and Vyasa only reproduces that conversation. So its validity is not attested.

In chandogya one is advised to contemnplate मनोमयः ब्राह्मणः and मनोमय is doubted to be Jeeva. And in contradiaction of it मनःमय is said to be Iswara and not Jeeva. But some one querries how he can distinguish between the two who are identical. Jeeva and Iswara are identical. To thes the reply is that the distinction is apperent and not real.

But there is no evidence to prove that the difference between Jeeva and Iswara is apparent or unreal. You cannot say or logically prove that difference by its very nature is unreal. "the difference between Jeeva and Iswara is Mithya, because it is difference, like the one between the moon (and the imaginary moon).

If difference is mithya what is Mithya ? If that is real, it amounts to apostasy. For it is said to be unreal. If it is meant to be 'indescribable' (अनिर्वाच्य) such a thing is not real then it is unreal itself. If mithya means 'that which is sublated after it is wrongly understood' this is not a new thing; for it has been already accepted. If mithya means 'essential non existance in the past, present and the future' it all again means false or unreal. If its conception is changed a little as 'that which has been perceived yet essentially uou-existing in the three times', this is not an old story. For this is not pure unreality. For whatis unreal is never pereceived.

This requires further analysis. The general statement made, means 'An unreal Thing is not perceived'. But is this perception direct or indirect? It is not direct perception that is derived of an unreal thing. For an unreal thing is said to exist and hence you cannot deny its perception. If only indirect perception is denied; indirectly you accept. For a verbal expression like this yields knowledge of the meaning. Mandana a staunch exponent of Advaitism has accepted this contingency. When thus critically examined Advaitism sustains a hollow defeat.

अभेदकौकस्त्वात्.

Raghavandra's method of elucidation is worth studying. It is well illustrated here. Both sutra and Teeka come within the orbit of his clarification and justification. First he explains the construction of the Sutra. In the Sutra there is नेतिचेत्. Here नेति should be construed with the statement of objection. Then the second न in the Sutra should be construed as इतिदुक्तं नतद्युक्तं 'Because he resides in a small place etc, he is not sarvagata. This statement is not reasonable.' Now the Purvapaksha is justified in the Teeka. For there is objection to the statement that Vishnu is Sarvagata. In अदृश्यत्वाधिकरण Vishnu is said to be Sarvagata and in Anandhikarana he is said to have no properties of Jeeva. Or on the strength of Smritics that are to be quoted, he is bereft of ignorance and transitoriness. So it is argued that just as Jeeva is not sarvagata though there are evidences to prove it, because there is strong opposition to it; so also though there are evidences to warrant the sarvagatatva of Vishnu, yet he is not so because

there is strong opposition to it. One is that he is said to reside in small places, and another is he is said to reside in the eyes which is the invariable mark of Jeeva. So Vishnu is not sarvagata as Jeeva is not. No doubt if both Jeeva and Vishnu are not sarvagata then this statement has no subject matter at all. But this sort of absurdity is unavoidable when a statement is beset with contradictions and oppositions.

The opponent's contention is that Vishnu is not sarvagata. But sidhantakara asserts that he is sarvagata and adduces reason to it. Both do not sail in the same boat as contended by purvapaksha. Sidhantakara claims an advantageous position for veda itself warrants Vishnu's residence in a small place compatible with his ubiquity. For if Vishnu is not found in small places he cannot be found in all places.

Now how Vishnu is found in all beings is explained. Vishnu's place in all beings is as the controller of all the seuses in them. Residing in the respective senses Vishnu prompts those seuses to their activities. So he is said to be इंद्रियमय and मयद् means 'as the controller'. This subject is fully explained in the last pada of the 2nd Adhyaya. Because he is the source of strength of seeing he is called चक्षुर्मय. In the same manner because he is the source of strength of hearing he is श्रोत्रमय and so on.

संभोगप्राप्तिः इति चेन्न वैशेष्यात्

If Jeeva and Vishnu reside in the same body, they both must have the same pleasures and pains. This objection holds good in either case; when the same jeeva resides

in all bodies or when the same Iswara resides in all bodies both will be subject to the experience of the same pleasures and pains. If both are caught in a burning house it cannot be that one suffers from the burning flame; to the exclusion of the other. Therefore even if Iswara is sarvagata he is subject to human sufferings.

Even if both reside in the same body Iswara claims immunity from human sufferings; because Iswara is blessed with extraordinary power which is not common with human soul. In Garuda Purana it is stated that Iswara and Jeeva were not subject to the experience of the same sufferings, because of difference between them of all knowledge and little knowledge, of all strength and little strength and of independence and dependence.

Now one distinguishing quality of all strength is enough to get immunity for Iswara. Where is the necessity of quoting omniscience of Iswara? The reason of quotation is this that though endowed with strength to avert, still the suffering happens. But this does not happen in the case of the Lord. This refutes the contention that because God is omniscient therefore He is subject to human sufferings otherwise He is not omniscient.

This statement that Brahma is to be meditated upon with these attributes (निचायत्वात्) puts an end to many objections like the word Brahman to be used in the Subordinate sense and many others. Thus at last it proves that Vishnu alone (तत्तु) is Anandamaya; because that तत्तु is repeated with every Sutra

TATTYAMANJARI ;

In the first Pada all nouns' referring to things other than Vishnu and occurring in sentences chosen from different

shakhas are shown to refer (Samanvaya) to Vishnu as attributive words in those contexts invariably showed his marks. This we find unreasonable. For some of those attributes no doubt were proved to belong to Vishnu. But many still remained unproved. Hence those attributive words serving as marks are shown in this Pada to refer to Vishnu.

Those attributive marks clearly referred to other things and were ambiguous in their reference to Vishnu. Thus here he is shown to possess those marks, which so long had been in a doubtful condition.

But one question arises here. And that is whether the marks are shown to refer to Vishnu on the strength of marks. In the first alternative there is mutual dependence and in the second alternative they are ambiguous. But those attributes which are warranted by evidences to refer to Vishnu, are in the same context unambiguously and exclusively referring to Vishnu and to none else. And these have been fully corroborated to referring to Vishnu by exclusive shruties also

Vishnu, called Prana, was ascribed unreasonably for upasana the attribute of तत्त्वत्व. For, in Aitareya some Aditya or Jeeva is told to reside in the cavity of the heart of all beings. Therefore तत्त्वत्व and अंतस्थत्व also must belong to either Aditya or Jeeva, for the context is this same. This residence in the cavity cannot reasonably belong to Vishnu who is said to be pervasive. Besides, if he is residing commonly with Jeeva in the same body then Vishnu will be subject to human pleasures and pains. As a reply to all these objections, following eight sutras.

beginning with sarvatraprashidhopadeshat, start with their work.

The whole of the Adhikarana is summarised in one word (सर्वगः) in Anubhashya 'Vishnu alone' should be construed with 'possesses all marks' as described in the Shruti एतस्यां एतदिवि. Now this Sarvaga or all pervasive is also situated in the body and heart's cavity of all beings; It is he who is called तत्तम before in Pranadhikarana; and so it is Vishnu; and not Aditya nor all Jeevas. The reason is that he possesses all marks In Shruties quoted like एतमेव ब्रह्म and others, he is exclusively said to be the meaning of Brahma; His bodilessness (अरासीरत्व) 'nature' Not-being heard, the object of eulogy made by Jeeva—these are the marks found in these Shruties which belong to Vishnu alone. This is corroborated by the Shruties quoted in Bhashya.

Raghavendra interprets this part of Anubhashya in another manner. "or the ubiquitous with these marks is Vishnu alone Those marks on the strength of sentences quoted in Bhashya belong to Vishnu This is the meaning of हि (for) in Anubhashya. एतमेव ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते The Brahma in Shruti used with a particle, meaning exclusiveness (एव) means Mukhya Brahma who is Vishnu. Had any other been Mukhya Brahma and had this been secondary Brahma, there would have been no such statement as एतमेवब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते. 'He tells this alone to be Brahma.' Unheardness also does not fit in with any other thing than Mukhya Brahma.

But we do admit that according to the rule applied in Namapada the word Aditya in the Shruti 'पुरुषं पुरुषं प्रति

आदित्यः is the chief Brahma or Vishnu, yet the marks of Aditya like Samvatsara saratva and others; चक्षुर्मयत्वं and others belong to Jeeva. So this controverts the previous statement. To this objection the reply is लिङ्गैः सर्वैः युतः सहि-All the marks justly belong to Vishnu alone. Samvatsara Saratva is the property of Vishnu. For samvatsara is four faced Brahma who is controlled by Vishnu and is fitly called. therefore, samvatsarasara for that reason. And this Hari as described in many shruties is one residing in Aditya. He is also chakshurmaya; because he resides in the eye and controls it. Hence he is as in Purnanananda, chakshurmaya; for he is endowed with complete power of Vision. (Mayat means full of).

Hari is omnipresent. Still he can reside in a small place without prejudicing his omnipresence For shruties like अंतः बहिः चतत् सर्वव्याप्य नारायण स्थितः up holding the idea that Narayana resides inside and outside of it covering the whole of it; and smrities like अहमात्मा गुडाकेश सर्व भूताशयस्थितः 'I reside in side the body of all beings, and also addncing reasons as in अंतरः खवत् this incompatibity has been reconciled.

From the preceding Sutra if you import खवत् here we have अंतरः खवत् So the whole statement means- Vishnu who is all pervasive like the sky, can reasonably reside also in small places.

Further Raghavendra explains the full implication of सर्वगो विष्णुः "He resides in these respective places, for the puspose of provoking their native capacity to action." This is the quotation from Anubhashya which thus makes

explicit the implicit purpose of सर्वगतत्वं as impulsion to activity of their intrinsic strength, resulting in its exhibition.

This involves Vishnu in another crisis. Coexisting with Jeevas, Vishnu Subjects himself to pleasures and pains similar to Jivas. But his extraordinary strength and power saves Him from this crisis. The pronoun स refers us back to the previous pada and states that the same Vishnu in whom samanvaya was shown there is referred to here as sarvagata.

TANTRADEEPIKA :

So far in the previous pada Samanvaya of all substantives having for their meaning something other than Vishnu was dialated upon; and now in this pada, samanvaya of such attributes which are marks is explained. सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपशात्. In this Adhikarana Samanvaya of a positive mark like 'existing in all places' is established. You must read तत्तु along with the Sutra. So the meaning of the Sutra is- सर्वत्र means in all Shruties like एतमस्यां एतदिवि, the one stated is तत्तु means Brahma only, why ? Because the word Brahma famous in all Shruties is used. The word Prasidha an adjective qualifying Brahma is used to show that in the case of Jeevas Such notability to qualify them, is denied.

On this side this will lead to विवक्षितगुणोपपत्तेः (तत्तु to be Construed with Sutra) compatibility with अभ्युत्तरं is possible only when Brahma is meant to be found in Praithivee and others; and not possible when Jeeva is

meant. This अभ्रुतत्व includes all attributes that are fit to be described at the end, in Shruties like सद्योतोऽभ्रुतः. The attributes mentioned at the end carry much weight in Settling the import.

But Jayateertha in Anuvyakhyana gives another meaning because one should not try to refute him when he says that Vishnu is capable even at a distance to move things to activity then why should he be proved to reside in all things in order to prompt them to activity by waking up their latent capacity ? this is the objection which is set at rest by his other meaning.

Now this अभ्रुतत्व may belong to Aditya; because the Shruti is devoted to Aditya. And it may belong to Jeevas as it is said to be चक्षुर्मय; and not to Vishnu as argued. To this objection the reply is अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शारीरः Read सर्वत्रोच्यमानं along with this. Here also तु means एव or only. Aditya or Jeeva having contact with body cannot be called Sarvagata. For they will be stated to be Anu or atom like; and when both are all pervasive, their Karma also will be all pervasive; and Self hood and conscious personality which determines the share of pleasure and pain is equally pervasive. So this upsets the very argument of allotment of pleasure and pain. The word तु (only) adds strength to incoherence and unadjustibility to be found in the opponent's argument,

The Sutra, instead of नैसरः has used न शारीरः with significant implication. For this suggests the incompatibility of अशरीरत्व, expressed in सद्यश्चायं अशरीरः, with Jeevas. Again Jeevas cannot be so; because कर्मकव्यपदेशात्.

The words सर्वत्र उच्यमानस्य and शारीरस्य which have occurred before should be thus changed and construed here with the Sutra. In the Shruti एतमस्यां one is said to be in all places like Prethive. This is mentioned as कर्म (आत्मानं) object in the Shruti आत्मानं परस्मै शंसति; while शारीर is mentioned as कर्ता (शंसति). There shareera is not Sarvagata. Had it been So Shareera or Jeeva would have been both subject and object in that sentence with the verb शंसति which is syntactically self contradictory in the case of one word.

But there are very strong marks of Jeeva in that context like चक्षुर्मयत्वं. So the words like ब्रह्मा should all be changed to mean others than Vishnu. As a rejoinder the Sutrakara says- शब्दविशेषात्. The word Brahma has a speciality of being construed with एव or exclusiveness, So Brahman cannot be interpreted as shareera. This exclusive Brahma signifies only chief shense which is Vishnu and not Jeeva.

Again words stated every where mean Brahma स्मृतेष्व. For in Smriti like Geeta it is stated- "oh Gudakesha I am Atma residing in the cavity of all beings." So every where that (Brahma) alone (is to be found). Here though Smriti is his own words yet as it is reproduction of others statement it is quoted here as evidence. Thus you must construe in future also.

Again what is stated is objected and then made clear in अर्भकौकस्त्वात्. And तत्तु is to be construed with the Sutra. Raghavendra dissolves and explains the compound अर्भकौकस्त्वात्. अर्भकं (small) ओकः (Place) यस्य सा तस्य भावः तत्त्वम्.

'because he resides in a small place' व्यपदेशात् should be construed here also. 'As it is stated that he resides in a small place like the cavity of the heart of all beings; (Again तद्व्यपदेशात् means) 'the Shareera or Jeeva on the Strength of Aditya Shruti and the mark of chakshur-mayatva is mentioned as Sarvagata' Therefore Brahma every where cannot mean Para Brahma or Vishnu. Besides Brahma as controller of the sense (नक्षुर्मय) cannot reside in the eyes as he is all pervasive.

To this objection first Sidhante for clarification asks some questions: Do you mean to say that his residence in a small place is useless or unreasonable? The first contention is not right For he is meditated upon as 'residing in small places and in the eye. Hence it is not useless. Nor the second is right. For the all pervasive can reside in a small place like the sky'. Just as the all pervasive sky can reside in different places, so also it is reasonable to state that Brahman stays in the cavity of the beings. Here some difference between the व्योमश्रुति and अल्पश्रुति is being reconciled. Already the three types of उपासा are referred to; yet निचायत्वात् is repeated, to show that उपासा is of the nature of knowledge. निचायत्वात् is derived from the root चायुदञ्जने So upasa is some mental activity and though it serves no purpose yet it is reasonable. Therefore you cannot contend that Shruti is not valid.

Taking objection to what has been said the Sutrakara says संभोगप्राप्तिः इति चेन्नवैशेष्यात्. Now संभोग in the Sutra means समानभोगः common enjoyment. If Brahma reside in all cavities of the Jeevas like the sky, Brahman will be

subjected to common enjoyment with the Jeevas with whom he resides.

This objection is sound. For there is some speciality with Brahman, some special strength. In the Untarnaya Adika rana Brahma is said to reside in some Jeevas and not all Jeevas as is contended here. Besides here pervasive Hari is said to occupy a small place quoting the instances of the sky.

NYAYAMUKTAVALI :

In the previous pada all substantives in innumerable vedas were affirmed to refer to Vishnu on the strength of marks occurring in those respective sentences. Some ambiguous marks are now ascertained to refer unmistakably to Vishnu in this Pada.

As usual Raghavendra offers the argument of the whole of the Adhikarana consisting of eight Sutras headed by *सर्वत्रप्रसिद्धोपदेशात्*. Really speaking there is no necessity of supplying a thought-link connecting the last Adhikarana of the fore gone Pada and the first Adhikarana of the forth coming Pada. Because there is no such expectancy on the part of the enquirer. If expected, it is the link of objection raised against what has been previously stated. In Aitareya in all beings like Prithivee, Dyau and other things, a thing is said to reside which is no other than Brahma. This thing that is stated every where in Shruti is doubted if it is Aditya or Jeeva, or Vishnu. The prima facie view runs as follows-the word Aditya that has occurred many times in Shruti, is referred by the pronouns *एतस्य* which has reference to *सर्वत्र*; and as it is

said to be its essence, it is a clear mark signifying Aditya. There is a Sauramantra beginning with चित्रदेवानां which mentions Aditya. And Aditya is not mentioned as residing in Aditya. For all these reasons Aditya only is sarvagata. Again there is the most noted mark of Jeeva as mentioned in चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयः which unmistakably connect him with these instrument of knowledge. 'He is in beings'. Jeeva is said to reside in living beings and not in other things. Hence he is said to reside in small places, which again is the mark of Jeeva. or 'all Jeevas' is meant as sarvagata. And not Vishnu as that runs counter to the marks and vedic statements cited. If inspite of these, Brahma is insisted to be sarvagata he will be subjected to common enjoyment of pleasures and pains with the coexisting Jeevas.

As against this, the Sidhanta argues—the word Brahma used in एतमेव ब्रह्मोऽस्यावक्षते is used in the famous sense of Vishnu in तदेव ब्रह्म परमं कवीनां. The chief meaning is Vishnu; while other meanings like universal or Jati are only unimportant. This meaning is specified with stress (एक) which is justified only in its being chief sense.

Besides in सयतोऽश्रुतोऽगती which forms the latter part of the sentence we hear complete inaudibility and other marks which are corroborated by Smrities like अहमात्मा गुडाकेश सर्वभूताशयस्थितः (गीत१०-२०). Then Raghavendra construes other statements to conform to this truth. संवत्सरोऽब्रजपतिः refers to fourfaced creator Brahma. And the essence belongs to sarvagata by the rule of Antarnaya. This all-residing Brahma without infringing his essence may condescend to reside in a small place like the cavity

of the heart. The logical soundness is further held up producing the instance of the sky.

The word भूत in सर्वभूतगतः is used for the sake of meditation. सर्वेषु भूतेषु becomes meaningful even when Brahma is said to reside in Aditya. Subjugation of the residing agent in Sarvabhutas reduces the agent to Similar experiences of grief and joy along with the Bhutas. But this charge is easily waved by his extraordinary power which secures Brahma immunity to experience of Similar grief and joy.

Again चक्षुर्दृश्य need not be the mark of Jeeva. मयट् means controller of senses like eye and ears which fits in with Vishnu; who can be the lord over eyesight. Now no opposition or contradictions comes in our way. On the other hand there is then strong opposition to the interpretation of the Purvapakshee. For both Aditya and Jeeva being atom-like in size cannot exist in many places (सर्वगतत्वं). So one who is said to reside in the earth and other things is Vishnu only. The ultimate result is that, as there is Aditya only in Bhutas and others, (एवकारः,) it shows that Vishnu exists in other places than Bhutas and hence he can be very well seen to be pervasive. It was formerly argued that Sarvagatatva that belonged to Vishnu as stated in Shruti was all pervasiveness and it was not a fair argument thus contended the opposition side and thus refuted the Sidhania side.

PRAKASHA :

Teeka does not supply thought link of the previous pada with the present Reference to othersources has supplied it.

Those marks which in the previous pada helped the names to have meaningful reference to Vishnu are shown how their compeers seek samanvaya in Hari in this Pada. Of course those marks of the previous pada many not all have found access to this pada. For 'Sleeping in the ocean and other marks of the previous Pada are not treated in this Pada for Samanvaya. Hence it is said that only Similar marks to the previous ones are shown to refer to Vishnu. And similarity consists of marks being components of sentences similar to the sentences of the previous Pada, Or certain marks that have been good reasons to show that names have references to Vishnu in the previous Pada. Marks similar to the afore said marks are treated for Samanvaya in Vishnu in this Pada.

Raghavendra gives an exposition which is both clear and comprehensive of what has been stated so long. All substantives in all shruties have been proved to have samanvaya in Vishnu though they are known to have references to other things, on the strength of those respective marks in those respective statements in the previous Pada. Leaving aside the unambiguous marks of Vishnu equivocal marks are chosen to be treated here.

Now you cannot try to corner us by asking us whether we prove the Samanvaya of the marks on the strength of of marks or names. As the marks are yet to be proved. they are still doubtful in their veracity; nor the second alternative is safe, for it is affected with mutual dependency. For when the validity of the Samanvaya of Names is proved the Linga Samanvaya would be proved valid. So there is no scope for cornering; for our stand is that unambiguous

marks and names prove the Samanvaya of these marks in this Pada.

All this argument melts down to the statement that the present Linga Samanvaya adduces reason to the Nama samanvaya previously stated or the present question rises up as the result of the previous statement. So the thought Link is that of cause and effect. Anuvyakhyana corroborates this fact.

सर्वत्रप्रसिद्धोपदेशात्

Here an objection is raised. In Teeka it is contended that the mark sarvagatatva is famously known to belong to some other (than Vishnu) because it is found in Aditya Shruti. This is not fair. For here सर्वगत means 'one residing in the cavity (of heart) of all beings'. Now this sarvagata belongs to Vishnu also. For it is said योवेद निहितं गृह्यात्, So taking into account the similar statement in Aditya Shruti, this mark residing in the cavity of beings' comes under the category of 'marks famous for belonging to both (Vishnu and others); and not only to others. Just, an instance is quoted. In Bhumadhikarana 'प्राणोवा आशया भूयान्' Prana is said to have Bhumatva at the beginning. Then in 'विष्णुर्वदिवेभ्यो भूयान्' the same Bhumatva (greatness) is said to belong to Vishnu. Thus Bhumatva is common to both Prana and Vishnu (उक्तयत्र प्रसिद्ध). Similar is the case with sarvagatatva.

This is not correct. For there is difference between the two. In the instance quoted it is agreed by the Purva paskee both at the beginning and in the Similar Shruti that Bhumatva belongs to Prana and Vishnu. Hence it is said

to belong to both Prana and Vishnu. But it is not so here. For the Purva pakshee has never agreed to the opinion that Sarvagatatva belongs to Vishnu. Hence it is not ubhayatra Prashidha.

But if this is insisted on, then there will be the same objection in the case of 'Jyoti in the cavity of the heart' (in Gayatri Adhikarana) which forms the topical statement (विषयवाक्य) and introduces अर्धकौकस्त्व (residing in a small place). But if objection is possible based upon whatever immediately precedes it, it must be expressed. Here when Bhashya and other sources are consulted, it is found that objection based on the previous Adhikarana is possible. Hence its necessity.

But this is not reasonable. For this sort of objection is possible even in the third Adhyaya in the third Pada. Hence non-mentioning of such an objection is counted as serious Omission-But when thought link with the previous Adhikarana is not possible as they are in different Padas then there is no point in objecting the omission.

It is stated in Tantrachudamani that there is no thought link between the last Adhikarana and the first Adhikarana of the coming Pada. If there is such thought continuity then there would be no division of Padas.

But this is not a sound objection. For the division of Padas can be based upon difference in subjects

The subject of the Adhikarana is Sarvagatatva. The doubt is whether this sarvagatatva belongs to Aditya and Jeeva or Vishnu? Then again whether Aditya in the previous sentence (तस्यैतस्यासौवादित्यः) refers to Aditya or to Brahma? Then again for this purpose we must settle

if Brahma in एतमेवब्रह्मा is used in its primary meaning or secondary meaning ? Then again if अभिकौकस्त्व fits in with Brahman or not ?

Ragavendra now relates the objection side with judgement side and makes clear the purpose of this sort of discussion. Residence in a small place' (अभिकौकस्त्वं) is residing exclusively in the Bhutas and no where else. This meaning we get on the strength of the word भूत used in भूतेषु. If this अल्पकौकस्त्व does not fit in with Brahman' then the word Brahman unavoidably shall have to be supposed to be used in the secondary meaning. As this does not run counter to the previous sentence; Aditya in this sentence to the topic of the sentence Then the pronoun एतम् in एतमस्या refers to Aditya and naturally सर्वगतस्त्व belongs to him.

But when अभिकौकस्त्व fits in with Brahman, then the word Brahma having nothing to counter act, does not connote the secondary meaning and hence the previous sentence cannot have Aditya for its topic. Hence Vishnu alone is सर्वगत. This is the net result of this discussion and as it is clearly evident it is not mentioned.

Now this discussion is based accepting the prima facie view to be Aditya as sarvagata. If you want to follow the same discussion accepting Jeeva as the sarvagata in the prima facie view then the discussion runs with a little modification. The doubt is whether Jeeva is sarvagata or Vishnu ? Then the Pronoun एतद् in एतमयमःस्थानं refers to what is going to be described or not. Even if it refers to

what is going to be described do चक्षुर्मयत्वं and others fit in with Vishnu or not ? For that purpose does मयट् (in चक्षुर्मय) mean 'having eyes as instruments' or 'being the controller of the eye; the other gaps should be filled in by guessing.

Now the Purvapaksha or objection view begins that Sarvagata is Aditya; for एतस्य refers to Aditya and he is रस. Now a counter objection is raised against this Purvapaksha that sarvagata cannot be any other than Vishnu. For Aditya denoting popularly some other than Vishnu may be made to denote Vishnu according to the rule enunciated in Antaradhikarana or the rule of mastery over the cause of application. But in Antrardhikarana there was the mark of 'sleeping on the ocean'; while here there is no such mark. The word Ganga in the expression 'cowpen in the Ganga' means the bank of Ganga; for there is the absurdity of a cowpen being in the current of the river. But in a similar expression 'Afish in the Ganga. Ganga cannot and does not mean the bank of the river' For here there is no such incompatibility or absurdity.

But this argument does not stand. For the cause of applicability in Aditya does not depend upon any other than Vishnu. Hence Aditya in its primary sense is Vishnu. Even many shruties containing Aditya cannot help the case. For Shruties having Vishnu in its primary sense conclusively prove that Aditya is Vishnu.

But in those shruties there are words like सवितृ and others and the rule of samavaya proves that those savitru and other words connote Vishnu and not the synonymams like Aditya and others connote Vishnu. This

is not reasonable for in that context the word अदिति is not occurring. Hence in the coming Adhikarana it would not have been proper to doubt whether the word अदिति has any other applicability. Besides it runs counter to the line of Anuvyakhyana “देवतांतरगा सर्वे शद्वृत्तिनिमित्ततः । विष्णुमेव वदंत्यद्वा”. All words meaning the remaining deities on the strength of the cause of applicability connote Vishnu.

Thus goes on the argument to controvert the objection view that Aditya means the sun or Jeeva. When already it is firmly established that all words meaning the deities convey Vishnu as the primary meaning, then there is no scope for the Purvapakshi to raise his objection.

But the Purvapakshi is justified in raising the afore said objection (sarvagata is Aditya or Jeeva and not Vishnu). For the following three reasons- 1) Though as explained the Aditya Shruti is capable of another meaning, yet in Jyoti statement the context is clear and unambiguous; and Jyoti Shruti and exclusive mark of Aditya get strength of exclusive application. 2) No doubt formerly words had been proved to refer to Vishnu, yet it was not explicit if that was the primary sense; and the doubt was still lingering if it allows another sense; and it was itself exclusive in application. 3) Now this samanvaya does not come under the pervuew of the rule or Nyaya quoted. Thus for these three reasons shruti (Aditya shruti) is exclusive and the Purvapaksha rises up with the flare of success.

After a full fledged discussion again it is proved that the Purvapaksha has been legitimately raised. For though Aditya and other words belonging to Devata class, have

been shown Sanmanvya in Hari; yet they have not been shown as having that meaning as the chief meaning. Nyaya Vivarana also corroborates the same meaning. Therefore the Purvapaksha is justified.

Now begins the Sidhanti. In Purvapaksha it was said if sarva gatatva belonged to Vishnu for which the word Brahma and the mark Ashrutatva are adduced as reason they are found to denote Aditya; and hence that is the unimportant meaning. So it does not connote Vishnu. Now Sidhanti contends that all those reasons shown to denote Aditya are favourably disposed to connote Vishnu. Hence Aditya Shruti does not stand opposed to Vishnu-meaning; and the word Brahma now uninterrupted signifies the primary meaning and not the Secondary. On the strength of this Brahma in its glorified meaning, Sarvagata in its association with Brahma, means Vishnu. This is the out line of the argument of Shidant.

It was argued that the Shruti had for its topic Aditya 1) on the strength of the mark 'Samvatsara sarvatva'. But this is not correct. For the word 'Samvatsara' means 'Prajapati'. in its secular and sacred sense. And one, superior to him is Vishnu. (तत्सार).

Having the coordinate यत् in सयश्चायं पुरुषे, यश्चासा वादित्ये there is no one popularly Known; yet there is Hari known in Shruti. The word Aditya again is known to mean Brahma. For it is one of the thousand names of Hari.

"All people favourably turned to" is the mark of Surya. But just as तिस्रहं रूपः means कूप in every house; so also पुरुषं पुरुषं प्रति आदित्यो भवति does not mean that every man is favourably turned to Aditya but to the one

immanent in every Purusha. Here there is reference only to 'immanence' and not to 'Abhimukhya' or 'face respect fully turned to'. Even if the latter is meant, it is the orb of the sun that can claim this 'Abhimukhya'. Deity sun is far away from the orb; still if the god sun can claim this Abhimukhya, equally well Vishnu that is immanent in it, can claim it.

Thus when the marks are disproved to refer to Aditya the sacred reference to Shruti is disproved. The whole can be explained thus. As will be explained later Brahma Shruties prominently prove that they refer to Vishnu as their main import. Aditya Shruti comes under the purview of the method of interpretation adopted in Antaradhikarana and hence refers to Vishnu.

But if Brahma Shruti is chiefly concerned here and on its strength Aditya Shruti is forced to refer to Vishnu; then if this is proved to refer to Vishnu, it would remove the detractors and Brahma would mean Vishnu. This is the logical flaw known as mutual dependence. But it cannot be argued that the real detractor of the sense of Brahma is अर्भकौकस्त्व or 'residing in a small place' and not Aditya Shruti as contended before. For even Shruti is said to be exclusive.

This whole contention is baseless. For mutual dependence cannot be proved; because the word Aditya yields scope to the sense of Vishnu on the strength of the usage in Shruti 'आदित्योऽङ्गतिरादित्यः' and this does not depend upon the ascertainment of the chief meaning of Brahma. Hence the circle of mutual dependence will not be complete.

Besides Brahma Shruti is the concluding Shruti (उपसंहार) and Aditya Shruti is at the beginning (उपक्रम). Hence Brahma Shruti gets preference over the upakrama Shruti. And all the marks that revive Aditya Shruti into life are interpreted other wise to suit Brahma Shruti. Now the mark of 'possession of eye sight' easily signifies surya to be Aditya and not Vishnu. But this comes within the purview of topic of Antaradhikaranā and according to the rule it can be easily made to signify Vishnu.

Even in Surya Mantra Surya is called Atma; because he receives all things and absorbs all things in him at the time of Pralaya. Hence it is a sure mark of Vishnu as he is said to be the controller of all.

As चक्षुस् itself is shown to be Brahma चक्षुर्मय which is used to signify Jeeva gives scope to the probability of signifying other referents. चक्षुर्मय may signify Vishnu in the sense of 'having a perfect Vision' or 'being the master of senses like the eyes.' And चक्षुर्मय is not Jeeva; because he cannot be modification of चक्षुर्मय or eye.

Staying in small limited spaces cannot come in the way of his being in all places. For it is a truism that one being able to stay in small places cannot stay in all places. Here Raghavendra cites a beautiful instance. Just as one who pronounces one letter after another is able to recite the whole of the Veda, and not one who does not recite a single letter, so also one who is found staying in a small place, can claim to be found in all places.

But here he is said to reside in Bhutas and hence he can claim to be found only in them not in all. This objection is hasty. For he is said to be in Bhutas and not, in

Bhutas only; and that too for the purpose of meditative worship.

Again Vishnu or Brhama is said not to reside in Aditya, Hence Sarvagata must be Aditya. This doubt or objection must have been cleared long ago. But context casually treats this objection with much benefit, Vishnu is said to be Sarvagata and Sarva or all includes Aditya also. So there is no exclusion of Aditya.

But the objector makes his position clear. Here Vishnu is not said to reside in Aditya particularly. This clarification makes his position still more insecure. For further quotations show that Vishnu is in all beings. And he is also called by all names. Hence one who resides in Aditya is called Aditya by name.

Thus जर्मकौकस्त्व or residence in a small place is shown justified by stating that it is exclusive in experience and hence overrides the claims of Aditya Shruti being stronger in application. This is accepted as main in meaning and has other implications, which like संवत्सरसार strengthen the cause of Aditya, with the support of words in Shruti and hence are injurious to Shidhanta. But the remaining part of Sutra viz व्योमवन्निचायत्वात् confront boldly the opposition and in its support the Teaka is explained.

Now the services of the other Sutas like प्रसिद्धोपदेशात् विविक्षितगुणोपत्तेश्च and others are sought and Shruti and Linga and others that are favourable to the Shidhanti are enlisted. Thus Sarvagata cited here, is proved to be Vishnu, setting aside the claims of opposition that Brahma cannot be used in an unimportant meaning when the important is possible of application.

Besides on the ground that Jeeva also can be justly called 'unheard of' and is also said to be *अक्षुभ्य*, if he is called Brahma in a subordinate sense, an exclusive statement will have no meaning. Since there is Vishnu other than Jeeva, who is Brahman in the principal sense and there are others like Jati and others which are Brahma in the minor sense. And hence there is nothing to exclude. But if you admit Vishnu to be chief meaning of Brahman, as there is no other chief Brahman, exclusion of others as the chief meaning of Brahman is possible.

Again atom like Jeeva cannot justly claim ubiquity. Here we must understand all the implications of this statement to know its full significance. If all the Jeevas individually claim ubiquity, then each Jeeva is subjected to enjoyment and suffering available in all bodies. But some circumstantial evidence is called forth to refute this charge of unwanted and undeserving experience of others' pleasure and pain. Just as Jeeva on his return journey from heaven or hell to this world before entering mother's womb to get his body, makes a short stay in a body that is the product of other's activities, and that is identified with, himself by a second Jeeva, and is not subjected to pleasures or pains inherent in the body; So also this atom like Jeeva though residing in all bodies need not be subjected to the experience of Pleasures and pains which are the products of others, activities. For the rule is that one is subject to those experiences which are the effects of one's activities, in a particular body, which again is the accumulated effect of one's activities in a former birth. So the stay of a Jeeva in other bodies need not entail on the guest Jeeva the sufferings of the host Jeeva.

But this leads to another puzzle. If all Jeevas since eternity reside in all bodies, then there is no orderly assignment of activity to any Jeeva. Why! the activity through the body of which one feels that is his own belongs to him. This may be the rule of assignment or even when pleasure and pain cannot be traced to any one's activity yet they belong to that body in which one entertains pride of possession.

But even this argument leads us no where. For as Jeeva is living in all bodies since eternity, he also feels pride of possession as regards all bodies. And the question of assignment of Karma and allotment of pleasure and pain remain as before in chaotic condition.

As for the question of a short stay of a Jeeva in a plant before he enters the mother's womb and his eligibility to enjoy and suffer from the experiences of the plant, the clear answer is that the Jeeva that enters the plant; and the masters of the respective senses bear no relationship with all those bodies, and hence that jeeva has no occasion or cause to suffer the plant's ills of life.

The same question arises with God or Iswara who is immanent in all bodies and still claims immunity to the pleasures and pains of the bodies in which he resides. But God claims immunity from these ills of the bodies on the Virtue of his extra-ordinary strength. Otherwise he also sails in the same boat coming in contact with all bodies. The Sutra संभोग प्राप्तिः इति चेन्न वैशेष्यात् explains this very question in respect of God.

But the opponent who accepts Jeeva to be Sarvagata shall have to explain certain other difficulties. For this

Sarvagata in other Vedic Statements is referred to as object of knowing and telling and Jeeva as the subject of those activities. This is mentioned in the Sutra कर्मकतृव्यपदेशात्. So Jeeva who is different from the Atma that is Sarvagata, cannot be Sarvagata. But the same Jeeva cannot be subject and object to the same verb. For generally subjectness and objectness are incompatible in the something. मां अहंजानामि and आत्मानं आवेत् अहंब्रह्मास्मि. illustrate the fact, no doubt, that both are compatible in the something. This is yet an exception and it is accepted as exception on the virtue of identity of both the subject and object, as the referent is the same in both मां and अहं. But in the present case Vishnu is sarvagata and चक्षुर्मय also may be made to refer to Vishnu. The Geeta statment that अहात्मागुडाकेश सर्वभूताद्यस्थितः corroborates this very truth.

Next chandrikara takes up the question of meaningful sequence of the Sutras for review. He must show consistency and continuity in thought development in the Sutras of the Sarvagatatva Adhikarana. The first Sutra (सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपदेशात्) is first because it introduces the 'reason given in the topical statement (एतमेव ब्रह्मेत्या चक्षते) and because the reason given is Shruti. The second is next to the first because it introduces Linga that is mentioned in the next sentence. (विवक्षितगुणापत्तेश्च) विवक्षित either means 'fit to be mentioned' or 'to be mentioned in future' Hence अश्रुतत्वादि and others being at the conclusion (उपसंहार) gather strength over the opposing evidences:

Or vedas are authorless; hence there is no desire to tell. So विवक्षित्वं means 'the purport' of the Vedas.

Hence as shruties express 'Their inability to approach,' 'beyond the reach of hearing' is the purport of shruti and it is not unreal or false, as contended by others.

In the third, after presenting evidences of shruti and Linga in support of the theory, the sutrakara exposes the flaws in the arguments of the opponent. In the third the inner flaw is exposed and in the fourth the outside flaw is brought to the notice.

In the third, sarvagatatva or all pervasiveness is absolutely incompatible with atom like nature of Jeeva. In the Sutra Jeeva is called shareeri, in order to show that Jeeva cannot be 'one without body'.

In the fourth, comes the outer contradiction after the inner incompatibility. Though Sarvagatatva is compatible with the nature of Jeeva, the remaining part of the sentence puts forth and assigns to it both subjectiveness and objectiveness (कथं कर्तृत्वमप्यवशेषात्) which is impossible in Jeeva.

Raghavendra shows an objection raised against this. For in the third Sutra itself some incompatibility is shown without reference to any particular type. Hence the incompatibility of both being a subject and object in Jeeva might very well have been shown in the third Sutra only.

But the fourth Sutra refers to outside self contradiction while the third Sutra refers to the incompatibility of Sarvagatatva. So it does not refer to incompatibility due to the fact that one and the same (Jeeva) is both subject and object.

Now the fifth is शब्दविशेषात्. But this ought to have been the second Sutra. For in this Sutra, the word Brahma, which as well might refer to Jeeva is shown not to refer to Jeeva. Yet it is fit to be the fifth Sutra. For it is true

that generally the state of being subject and object pleads for difference between them. But as a case of exception, the relationship of Subject and object may be consistently found in the same Jeeva. Yet when there is exclusive assertion that 'he alone is called Brahma' there is no scope for exceptional reference to one Jeeva. Thus this Sutra is fit to be fifth. As this is not an independent reason adduced, no च is used in the Sutra.

In the Sixth Sutra स्मृतेश्च, smriti is quoted to corroborate, after Shruti was cited in the fifth to prove the side of the Sidhant. And in the Seventh when by the corroboration of Smriti it was proved that this all pervasive has a very small place to reside in, it was found that just as atom like cannot possibly be all pervasive, so also all pervasive Brahma cannot consistently be residing in a small place. This inconsistency in the tenet of the Sidhanti is removed in this Sutra, giving the instance of the sky (व्योमवत्). This is cited 'for the sake of meditation' and thus supplies 'the purpose' of the statement that 'it resides in a small place'.

In the eighth it is discussed that no doubt like the sky all pervasive Brahma also might reside in a small place. But Brahma is not insentient like the sky. Brahma is chetana, sentient. So he will be subject. So he will be subjected to the experience of pleasure and pain when Brahma resides in the small place like the heart of a living being (संभोगप्राप्तिः). This is really harmful to Sidhant and this opposition is successfully refuted in this Sutra.

Now Chandrikakara quotes the interpretation of Shankara and reviews it critically. The topical sentence chosen by Advaiti is सक्तुं कुर्वीत मनोमयः प्राण शरीरोभासः सत्यसंकल्पः

from chandogya, third Adhyaya. "Let him form a resolve and meditate upon Him who consists of mind, whose body is Prana, whose form is Light and whose will comes true."

Now the question arises who is this that is to be meditated upon. Is he Jeeva or the individual soul or is he Brahman? Bhamatikara presents the purvapaksha or objection thus. It is the Jeeva that is endowed with the attributes of mind and breath. For Brahman is pure and has no attributes, much less mind and breath. For Jeeva is made up of causes and effects and hence has the contact of Mind and others. But Brahman on the other hand is stated to have no mind and breath (अप्राणोऽहमनाः) No doubt the sentence 'everything is said to be Brahman' refers to Brahman yet it is not the object of meditation in the sentence कर्तुं कुर्वीत. For that sentence establishes 'Tranquility' and puts it as the reason for upasana, by reciting the Sentence सत्कर्तुं कुर्वीत. All this world consists of Brahman, as it is born of Brahman and is absorbed by Brahman. Therefore one should get rid of attachment, detestation and be tranquil to meditate upon. In the enjoinder the one should meditate upon is naturally and syntactically related to Jeeva, as its object, as it is mentioned in the same context to be made up of mind and breath. Therefore it is not proper to connect it to Brahman mentioned next. The attributes 'True will and others which are found consistent with the nature of Brahman, may be aligned with Jeeva as both are identical.

To this opposition's view the Sidhanta according to Bhamatikara presents the refutation. Now the object of meditation is said to be प्राणशरीर (प्राणः शरीरं अस्य) he to

whom Prana is the body This pronoun 'he' in the compound refers to the nearest noun (सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म) Brahman. Hence Prana shareera is Brahma मनोमय also (as मयट् has many meanings) may mean Brahman along with Jeeva. And hence there is no special reason for preferring Jeeva to Brahman. 'True will and others' are attributes which conform to the nature of Brahman and not to Jeeva. Really speaking सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म has some other contextual reference, yet that will satisfy the query of who the object of meditation is. Thus Brahman is the object of meditation.

The attributes of Jeeva will not come in the way of this interpretation. They conform to the nature of Brahman also as both Jeeva and Brahman are identical. The reverse of this is not possible. (क्रतुर्कुर्वीत means ध्यानं कुर्वीत OR उपासीत you should meditate or worship meditatively.)

Raghavendra explains the logical fallacy in the argument of the Advaiti. For in our interpretation we can cite a topical sentence which is in conformity with what has preceded, which affords ground or seed for doubt and prima facie view, and which is held up by a special word of the same sentence. Under these circumstances it is not proper to quote a sentence which is bereft of all these benefits.

You should not counter-argue that my sentence also has such words as सत्यसंकल्पश्च which attributes belonging to Brahman create scope for doubt. For मनोमय and others that come before सत्यसंकल्प and others may allow other interpretations according to the rules of interpretation adopted in आनन्दमयाधिकरण and may allow the successor

सत्यसंकल्पश्च to override the claims of the predecessor मनोमयत्वं and others by contradicting their meaning. No doubt even if the predecessor coming first has a priority over the successor yet the successor being numerous and pertaining exclusively to that meaning gets an upper hand in this dialectical fray; and the predecessor having other outlets of meaning is easily led to mean differently.

In the Previous Adhikarana when you found upakrama and upasamhara (beginning and end) agreeing to gether in having one sentence with one purport, then you induced the marks of both Jeeva and mukhyaprana to mean Brahman only. So also here the beginning is सर्वं खलु इदं ब्रह्म and the end is एतद्ब्रह्म मनोमय and others are to be induced to mean Brahman. And So there cannot be any difference in meaning allowing Purvapaksha to thrive.

The Advaiti while establishing Sidhanta of this Sutra said that the attributes of Jeeva are Super-imposed on Brahman; this is not reasonable For when the Substratum of illusion viz the rope is apprehended with its peculiar characteristic viz ropeness, terribleness of a snake cannot be imposed upon the rope. In the same manner when Brahman is apprehended with his innate characteristic viz Satyakamatva, then the attributes of Jeeva (Manomayatva) cannot be imposed upon Brahma.

No doubt when there is the (mis) apprehension of the superimposed attributes of a snake, there is the Substratum (rope). But when the substratum rope is apprehended with its ropeness, then there is no snake which is super imposed.

But the apprehension of Brahma is only verbal and indirect knowledge born of shruti and not direct realisation

Hence it cannot counter act superimposed attributes of Jeeva. The conch shell, naturally white is seen to be yellow on account of the effect of bile. But mere inference of whiteness of the shell does not counter act the superimposed yellowness of the shell. Only direct perception of the white shell disillusion man and yellowness ceases to be perceived. This is Advaiti's contention.

But this contention is not logically sound. For we do admit that the knowledge of Brahma attributes like सत्यकामत्वं is indirect, still it can counteract indirect illusory knowledge 'of atomic nature' is derived from verbal knowledge and hence indirect. So this is not conditioned illusion. And in Advaita system 'such statements refer to Brahma qualified with such attributes as सत्यसंकल्प. And this qualified Brahma and Jeeva are both superimposed on pure Brahma (attributeless) Then how can Jeeva and Saguna Brahma be in the relationship of (one) Super imposed and (another) substratum ?

But it is like this:- यः सत्यकामः सोऽपीयान्. In this statement that which is the Substratum for the superimposition of satyakamatva. is the substratum also for the superimposition of Aneeyattva. It is like the statement- that which was the trunk of the tree in the anthill, is the man.

This is not tenable. For just as dreadfulness with reference to rope is false, so also Manomayatva with reference to Brahman in the Shruti, shall have to be false or invalid. Besides this statement is accepted by the Advaitin to prescribe worship of Brahman endowed with that attribute.

But the Advaitin contends that monomayatva and other attributes in Brahman are empirically true while

Satyasankalpatva and others in Jeeva are apparently true or illusory. when shruties can continue to be valid with emperical truth why force them to be of apparent truth amounting to almost great invalidity.

This contention leads him no where. For Brahma is said to (अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्रः) be one without mind and life. Therefore even in Brahma these attributes, as they have no existence at all, are illusory. And in Advaita system as the attributes of Jeeva also are accepted to be emperical or Vyavaharika the attributes of Brahma must be unreal.

This includes many more logical flaws which may be presented as follows. It was declared before, that, atomic nature was attributed to Jeeva and hugeness or Jyayastva was attributed to Brahma. Even this statement is not tenable. For अणोरणीयान् declares atomic nature of Brahma compatible with his unlimited hugeness. If those contradictory attributes are found irreconciliable in Brahma, then we shall have to accept Brahman's littleness as it first occurs in Shruti to the exclusion of hugeness which occurs later in Shruti. But really hugeness of Brahma is compatible with his littleness as great pandits of vedic lore have successfully shown, in the case of the sky.

Thus Advaitin cannot set up his Purvapaksha and Sidhanta cogently. Now chandrikakara proceeds to show that Advaita's interpretation of sutra also is not acceptable.

Raghavendra summarises for us the whole of the argument of the Adhikarana so that we may be able to follow the refutation of this interpretation of the Advaitin. In the first Sutra 'that which is to be meditated

upon as having the attributes of Manomayatva and others is Brahman' should be taken for granted as a thing to be proved Sadhya' for which the reason adduced is that 'the attributes which form the import of statement viz. Satya, kamatva and others' fit in with Brahma (विवक्षितगुणोपपत्तेः). They do not fit in with Jeeva (अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शरीरः). In the vedic statement एतमितः प्रेत्य अस्मि संभवितास्मि as Brahman is mentioned as object by the word एतम् in the accusative case; and Jeeva is mentioned as subject by the word अभिसंभवितास्मि in the nominative case, the embodied Jeeva is not the object of meditation. For a special word is used for Jeeva in a different vedic statement of the same context: "यथाब्रूहिर्वा यवोवा....एवं अंतरात्मन् गुरुषो हिरण्यः" Here words signifying Jeeva and Brahma are used in different cases one in the nominative case and another in the Locative case. The statement in Geeta ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां also confirms this view. An objection that all pervasive Brahma cannot be in a small place is not sound. For Brahma is to be visualised in the lotus-like heart and hence he is said to reside in a small place and he can do so, like the sky which can also be smaller than an ordinary needle. If again Brahma is doubted to be liable to affection of joy and grief on account of his stay in the heart of Jeeva, it is discarded by stating that Brahma has speciality of immunity to sins and blemishes.

Now this interpretation is critically reviewed step by step, by Chandrikakara. But Raghavendra enters into the course of criticism only when the former asks us to imagine drawbacks in other sutras, ourselves. In the sixth this Advaitin quotes Geeta as we have seen (ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां)

Here Jeeva that is mentioned in the genative case is ascertained to be the resort and is different from Brahman that is mentioned here in the nominative case (ईश्वरः). Hence this Smṛiti with the other Shruti of the Sixth Sūtra is already forestalled by the fifth Sūtra and thus the Sixth is rendered redundant.

If in the seventh Sūtra it is stated that Brahman being all pervasive cannot reside in a small place like the heart of Jeeva, those attributes are recommended for meditation, then in the same manner why not argue the reverse of this that the attributes like greatness not compatible with the nature of Jeeva may be recommended for meditation; and this naturally leads to absurdity.

Some on the other hand interpret the Adhikarana thus. The vedic statement सर्वल्लुङ्गं ब्रह्मा is about Brahman. But कर्तुं कुर्वीत only restates upasana or meditation and through it enjoins the quality of 'Tranquility'. Hence Brahman is not the object of meditation. Only the sentence मनोमय supplies us Jeeva as the object of meditation. Thus two different topics are accepted by Purvaksha, by others.

But these contend that this sentence 'one being tranquil should meditate upon sarvatmaka Brahman' enjoins meditation and the sentence कर्तुं कुर्वीत in order to enjoin qualities like मनोमयत्व only restates the former enjoinder. Therefore the meaning of the whole sentence is "The Sarvatmaka Brahman should be meditated upon as having the quality of मनोमयत्व." Thus they bring about unity in the sentence.

So if the word Brahman signifies Jeeva then he should be meditated upon. If on the other hand it signifies Brahman then let Brahman be meditated upon, with that quality. So the topic of discussion naturally happens to be whether the word Brahman means Jeeva or Paramatman. The Purva Paksha is that the word Brahman means Jeeva and not Brahman. And the Sidhanta is that the word Sarvatmaka Brahman means Brahma only. Accordingly the Sutra also is interpreted.

Why the word Brahma should mean Brahman is explained thus. The Sutra supplies the reason as प्रसिद्धोपदेशात् "Because it is stated as famous." What is stated as famous? The cause of birth and others. The Sarvatmaka is well known to be the cause of birth and others". Thus it is syntactically connected. The word खलु signifies the celebrity of Sarvatmya and the word इति shows the reputation of Hetu or cause of Creation. And the whole Sutra means- "Because इति means हेतु and only a well known thing is raised to the status of a Hetu, therefore the cause of creation is known to be famous. Therefore both Sarvatma and Hetu are stated to be famous by the words खलु and इति

Now the whole interpretation consisting of Purva paksha and Sidhanta is refuted. Here in your interpretation in the other sentence Brahman is not known to be the cause of creation. For the Purvapaksha is possible as the one mentioned in यतोवा also can very well be Jeeva, if the one mentioned in सर्वखलुइदंज्ञा as cause were Jeeva.

Even the Sutra interpretation is shown to be unwarranted. For if you want to prove that what Brahman means

is both Parabrahma and Sarvatmaka then the vedic statement would have been सर्वत्रह्य and not सर्वत्रब्रह्म. No doubt सर्वत्र is there to mean 'in the whole of the world' But there is no word to mean "what the word Brahma means is Brahma only" and it shall have to be taken for under stood

Other Sutras of this Adhikarana also should be critically reviewed in this very manner. Raghavendra takes the lead and shows the method of refutation of other Sutras. He begins with विवक्षितगुणोपपत्तेः. The qualities that are to be mentioned at the end (उपसंहार) like मनोमय and others chime in with Paramatma only and hence the one mentioned here is Paramatma. As they do not fall in with Jeeva he is not Jeeva or the embodied. Because Brahma and Jeeva are mentioned as object and agent (इतः प्रेत्य अभिसंभवितस्मि) as one is to reach and the other is to be reached. Again both are mentioned by special words one in the Locative and the other in the nominative (सम्बन्धविशेष). So he is not the embodied Jeeva.

But this interpretation does not run on the right lines. For the qualities that are going to be told accord with Brahman and hence it is implied that they do not fall in with Jeeva. Consequently the third Sutra becomes redundant. And such cases of redundancy and repetition can be exposed in many other places also.

But Again in the Sutra अर्भकौकस्त्वात्, littleness or अणोयस्त्व is attributed to Brahman and his littleness is conditioned because it is measured by the dimensions of the heart of man in which Atman resides. Then Jyayastva also is attributed to him which is unconditioned, or natural. For

no such condition is mentioned for his greatness or Jyayastva.

This discrepancy is not real. For he himself in his Bhashya says—उपासकहृदयस्य अगुण्ठमात्रत्वात्. Now this Hridaya or heart brings about littleness of Atma which is less than a mustard seed and hence it is unconditioned. For a condition is that which settles the dimension of a thing. Now Hridaya is the condition for Atma's littleness. But for Jyayastva there is no condition. Prithivee should not be considered its condition for Jyayastva. For Atma is said to be greater than Prithivee. And that Prithivee is a standard which measures the greatness of Atma and not the condition which measures its dimensions. So that which is greater in dimensions cannot measure the dimensions of one that is less. So Hridaya cannot measure the dimensions of Atma that is less than Hridaya. Hence Atma is not conditioned, for hridaya cannot condition it. Besides littleness and greatness cannot be found in one thing and when one is contradicted and proved false the other, some how can be passed for a conditioned thing. But the contrariness of the two can very well be reconciled. For Jyayastva as against Aneeyastva does not mean largeness in dimensions or hugeness; but it means Praiseworthiness. For the word Jyayan may be derived to mean largeness in volume वृद्धिमत्त्वं and greatness in merit, प्रशस्त्वं. So littleness and praiseworthiness are compatible and hence littleness is natural and not conditioned. This is accepting the antagonist's position.

But really speaking we accept that littleness and greatness are natural as stated before, still there is no opposition or incompatibility between them. This also silences the

contention that the first two Sutras form an Adhikarana. There the doubt is entertained whether Jeeva is the one having manomayatwa or Shiva. Because he is referred to as wandering from the earth to heaven, he is said to be Jeeva. But as it is said of him (सर्ववत्स्विदं ब्रह्म) that he should be worshipped as the universal cause, he is Shiva and not Jeeva. This is the process of his Puavapraksha and Sidhanta argument.

But this is not to the point, For it is Mahavishnu that is Manomaya and none else. If two Sutras alone constitute the Adhikarana; and if अनुपपत्तिः and other sutras do not form This Adhikarana Sambhoga Prapli and others do not enter into this Adhikarana either as doubts or as explanations and hence there is no scope to arrive at the confirmed conclusion.

The other six Sutras forming a Seperate Adhikarana argue thus:-These have the topical statment 'पति विश्वस्या-
हमेस्वरं शाश्वतं शिवमच्ययुतं । नारायणं महाज्ञेयं' and entertain a doubt whether the person denoted by Narayana is Vishnu of universal essence or Shiva. Then in Purvapaksha Vishnu is said to be Narayana having the exclusive mark of 'residence in the ocean' and the Achyuta Shruti. But Sidhanta is that Narayana is Shiva only as he is said to be पशनापतये वृक्षाणापतये विश्वाधिक्रोरोद्रोमहृषिः and Vishva Patitva and others are the exclusive names of Shiva and they do not fit in with Vishnu.

But this argument is not tenable as in the Smriti statement, at first we meet with decisive marks and exclusive statements of Vishnu which do not allow the doubt to rise And VishvaPatitva chimes in with Vishnu as he is popularly

known to protect the world and stated so in Shrutis and Smritis. Further this Narayana is said to be the father of the four faced Brahma, which is a confirmed and exclusive mark of Vishnu.

ATTRITVADHIKARANAM

It was stated जन्माद्यस्ययतः (in the 2nd Sutra of Adh-1) There is mentioned अतृत्व or consumption of some Aditi in "स्यद्यदेव असृजत whatever he created he desired to eat. Aditi is socalled because She cousumes all. "But in स्यद्यदेव असृजत, or he is masculine gender as in कूटस्थोऽक्षरज्यते, कूटस्थस is masculine gender.

NOW IN THIS CONTEXT IT IS STATED

अत्ताक्षराक्षरहृणात्

SUTRA :

अत्ता The all consumer (सर्ववाअत्ति He consumes all) is Vishnu and not Aditi. Why ? Because the sentient (चर) and the insentient (अचर) are mentioned as objects of Cousumption.

BHASHYA :

Aditi cnaot be the cousumer of sentient and insentiant But Purushottama, the best among Purusha Vasudeva (Krishna) is an independent creator of the whole world! the protector and consumer (eater); and other than he like Brahma and others are creators of a part of it that too dependent on him and independently they are not (skanda Purana).

Formerly before creation of the world in Pralaya, He was also the one protector of this world. In Laya this world enters into Him, and in Mukti also. And may this Hari eat oblation (in the Sacrifice) for our longevity. (Ghrīta Sukta)

प्रकरणाच्च

SUTRA :

On the strength of the context also (नैवेदिकेन) the consumer is Vishnu.

BHASHYA :

Because it is the context of that (Hari), where creation of waters and creation of the creator Brahma Samvatsar by name, are described.

Then Jeeva and others were covered by Mrityu or Janardana. (Then) nothing was there before. Then Mrityu in the form of Hari was there. Janardana of his own sweet will, created water. Sleeping alone he created this huge world. The Lord created the Brahma by name Samvatsara. To swallow him Vishnu opened his mouth when he cried loudly. Then through compassion for him, appointed him to do the job of creation. (Brahma vaivarta)

BHAVADEEPA :

Here अत्त्व of Vishnu is of the kind of spider. For agent of destruction is the same as the agent of creation. This is cited here in order to provide a ground for objection

against what has been said before. Otherwise if the agent of consumption is different (from the agent of creation) we would not have been justified in objecting to the definition of Brahman as the destroyer.

The cause of application of the word अदिति is consumption or destruction of all. For if she is not all destroying she will not be called Aditi.

Now there is scope for doubt as to who is this Aditi who consumes all in its unlimited sense. In different periods of time we may find one consuming all in total. Hence there is scope for doubt and its settlement.

Hence if Aditi comes to be proved that is all consumer then all consumption attributed Brahma in जन्माद्यस्ययतः will be questioned.

When all names of other gods are made to refer to Vishnu as in Antarnayadhikarana by great derivation and convention of the wise. The mark sarvatritva is an exclusive mark of Aditi and not the mark of Vishnu; for he is notorious for his abstamiousness (अनशनन्नन्यो अभिचाक सीति) In Sidhanta Aditi is proved to be Vishnu. For the mark of all consuming nature is found only in Vishnu and not in any other deity. Shruti and Linga of doubtful varacity are weaker than Linga and Preakarana of determined varacity. As for his abstameousness (अनशन) You will get explanation in due course.

Shruti and Linga that are amenable to many interpretations are easily contradicted by an exclusive Linga and much more so by the combination of an exclusive context. Hence the Sutra runs as प्रकारणात्.

Here we have a chapter devoted to Vishnu in which this सर्वतृत्व occurs. Suppose sentences expressive of Shruti and Linga purport to refer to some other thing on the Strength of upakrama and upasamhara. Then Linga plays a part in settling the context. Hence here the context is settled to be of Vishnu. Thus with the aid of Linga and Prakarana that are exclusive in sense, it is proved that Atta is Vishnu.

TANTRA DEEPIKA :

In this Adhikarana (अत्ताचराचरग्रहणात्). Linga Samanvaya is sought for. This Linga is of the nature of action of destruction. The topical statement is सर्ववाञ्छति (He eats all). This अत्ता or consumer (eater) is that (तत्), Brahma only, and not Aditi. For eater of all, means both चर and अचर both sentient and insentient. Both these are mentioned as objects of consumption. As तत् is used it ought to be only अत् (Neut) and not अत्ता in masculine should have been used. But masculine is used because in सत्तयावाचातेनात्मना the masculine form of तत् (सः) is used in the place of सत् in the Shruti whose meaning is to be determined. In the Sutra सर्व ought to have been used; चर चर is used following the Shruti; and it is only the explanation of सर्व, in order to remove the doubt that it is used in a limited sense.

So the next Sutra runs as- प्रकरणात्. The vedic statement नवेहकिचन has Brahma context. Therefore Atta is Brahma only.

NYAYA MUKTAVALI :

In this Adhikarana Purvapaksha is based on difference from what has been said. So the thought link is counter instance to a former instance. In Brihadaranyaka it is stated that "He determined to eat whatever he had created. Because he eats all therefore he is called Aditi." Now this Aditi is Aditi the mother of gods or Vishnu? This is the doubt. The Prima facie view is This is Aditi the mother of gods. For there is the Shruti to that effect and the clear mark अवित्त्व.

No doubt in the previous portion it is settled that Aditya is Vishnu; because, even though there Shruti containing the word Savitri a synonym of Aditya, in Antarnaya Vishayavakya it was proved that it was devoted to Vishnu; and hence Aditya shruti also belonged to Vishnu. Still here it is not yet settled that Aditi is Vishnu; and Shruti does not give scope to any other interpretation.

The Linga अक्षुत्व also is equally exclusive and it does not accord with Vishnu; For Vishnu is described as practicing abstemiousness (अनश्नन् अन्यः). So both Shruti and Linga exclusively refer to Aditi. If Shruti yields to other interpretation according to Antarnaya Nyaya, at least Linga is there which is exclusively devoted to Aditi avoiding scrupulously Vishnu.

Now comes Sidhanta:- अक्षुत्व is सर्वक्षुत्व consuming all and this wholesale destruction belongs exclusively to Vishnu alone on the evidence of Shruti and Smriti. The Linga अवित्त्व which is the cause of application of the word Aditi, and the Aditi Shruti can be any how made to

refer to Vishnu. Besides नैवेहिकिचन नाग्रे आसीत् मृत्युर्नैव इदं आवृत्तं आसीत् 'At first there was nothing here, all was encroached by Mritu alone', forms the context exclusively devoted to Brahma. Vishnu alone is Atta. The Shruti that describes abstamiousness of Vishnu will be explained later on. The result of this discussion leads us to prove that Aditi also on the strength of Shruti and Linga is an all consumer of a limited kind and Vishnu consumes the remaining and hence the definition of 'all consuming agent' is overextensive or Aditi her self is the, unlimited all-consumer. Hence this forms a strong objection to the 2nd Sutra जन्माद्यस्य and its explanation is the ultimate purpose of discussion.

TALTVAMANJARI :

In Janmadhyadhikarana it was decided that Vishnu was all doer. All doing includes cosmic creation, sustenance, and destruction. This is in conflict with some Kanva statement that Aditi is said to be all-destroyer as she is called 'All cousumer'.

So now follow two Sutras अत्ता and another. The meaning of the Sutra(अत्ता) is :- This Atta or 'all consumer' is Vishnu only. For all marks are in his favour. He who is said to be 'one who consumes all' is the same as 'one who is all doer in the previous discussion. So he is Vishnu and not Aditi.

Because he has all marks in his favour. The very context in which all marks exist, belongs to Vishnu which hence does not allow 'all consuming' to have a limited sense of 'cousuming some'. For this all consumer is said to be all

alone at the time of universal deluge. There are also other exclusive marks which are in Vishnu's favour, like creation of water and Sanvatsara, attempt to eat up chaturmukha. Thus 'all-consumer' favoured by these marks is Vishnu alone. The word 'All' is very significant, because this does not give scope for supposing that Aditi is the consumer of some, while Vishnu is the consumer of the remaining. Hari is the one exclusive and universal destroyer of all things.

Though by repeating from the previous context we get Vishnu here, yet सः is used to show that both सर्वकर्ता of the previous context and सर्वअन्ति the all consumer here are identical. or Mrityu introduced previously is the present 'All consumer' (अन्ति).

PRAKASHA :

The thought link of this Adhikarana must be established with what has been discussed. Though this is not included in Janmadi yet it is concerned with the result of it. In this spirit a counter instance is given here. This sets aside the objection that the Aditi Shruti has wide application and the mark is exclusive in application and that Linga and not Shruti is known to connote other meaning. On the other hand Shruti and not Linga is referring more to others. How then Linga with Shruti is able to refer to others? This is not tenable for we are going to state that Shruti is exclusive, in contrast to what has been said before and Shruti is fixed in its meaning in preference to popular sense. There by you should not suppose that only nouns are treated for samanvaya. But here mere (Lingas) marks are treated for samanvaya in order to

justify the propriety of the pada, and to manifest the extra ordinary quality of 'all-consumingness' in Hari.

Now the topical sentence for discussion is सर्वं वा अतीति तददितेरदितित्वम्. Because अदिति is all devouring or destroying, therefore she is called Aditi. And this all-consumingness will be justified in Aditi even if she were ascertained to consume some also that are accepted, which would limit the sense of सर्वं or all. Thus the result of Purvaparksha is that Aditi is all consumer. When 'all-consumingness' is construed as reason for being Aditi, then there is no reason for limitation of 'all' and then Aditi means Vishnu; and this is the result of Sidhanta. As this is apparently clear it is not explicitly expressed.

Reghavendra here explains apparent discrepancy, between Nyayavivarana and Bhashya and Teeka. It is declared that Linga (mark) and Prakarana (context) of determined meaning constitute a more powerful interpretative instrument than Shruti and Linga of dubious sense. But in Nyayavivarana Shruti alone is said to be of doubtful meaning and Ling is not declared to be so. In Bhashya Teeka and Nyayavivarana Teeka Shruti is considered to be amenable to different applications, and Linga to be exclusive in application; and Purvaparksha is based on this. According to this view Linga is Niravakash or of exclusive application. But if Shruti also is Niravakash then there will be no difficulty to exposition. And in Nyayavivarana on the Strength of the use of च the copulative conjunction it is deduced that both propound Purvaparksha. Accordingly both are required to be Nirava-

kasha This is the view of Nyayavivarana. We must mark that **संदिग्ध** is reduced to **सावकाश** here.

Now Niravakashatva of Shruti is of two Kinds:-
1) Formerly the synonyms of Aditi also are not shown to refer to Vishnu. or 2) There is no exclusive mark of Vishnu to contradict Shruti. So Antarnaya Nyaya isn't applicable here.

The first is taken up for discussion. Now Aditi herself is said to be the all consumer (and not Vishnu). For Shruti (तद्वित्तेः) declares to that effect. But it is objected that just as though there was Aditya Shruti 'All pervasive' was declared to be Vishnu, so also why should not Vishnu be 'all consumer' though there is Aditi Shruti? The instance does not accord with the present case. For there in 'All pervasive' the word Savitri the synonym of Aditya was shown to refer to Vishnu; but here, the synonym of Aditi is not shown to refer to Vishnu. Therefore Aditi herself is the 'all consumer' on account of Shruti and the mark Adititva.

Here Linga is considered niravakasha, because Shruti is considered Niravakasha (exclusive). But there is also the alternative that Shruti is Savakash (amenable to other interpretations.) In stead of deciding this how is it that Linga is introduced here? Linga is introduced because if the अदितिश्रुति has primary reference to Vishnu then the Linga also has preimary reference to Vishnu. If secondary then secondary reference to Vishnu.

But this argument is not sound. In गङ्गायां घोषः the word Ganaga is used in the secondary sense of 'bank' (तीर) yet there is no usage to the effect that there is गङ्गात्व in तीर.

In the same manner though Shruthi might refer to Brahman secondarily yet Linga अदितित्व might not refer to Brahman even secondarily. This is the view of Teeka.

Really speaking, before this the word Aditi or its^s synonym does not refer to Vishnu. Hence it does not primarily refer to Brahman. Only because Indra and other words like Aditi are only said to refer to Vishnu, the cause of application of the word Aditi need not be found in Hari. So Aditi may refer to Brahman at the most, secondarily. If on the other hand Aditi is to mean Brahman primarily then the cause of application of Aditi viz अदितित्व must be found in Brahman in its primary sense.

Or Though Aditi refers to Brahman according to Antarnaya having set aside Rudhi or convention, yet Brahman who is notoriously known to be abstemious cannot share Adititva which means consumption. This is the view of Teeka. Or still as in the Aditi Shruti there is no Vishnu mark, there is no scope for Antradbikarana. And as Aditi clearly refers to the mother of gods, so Adititva also belongs to her.

Here an instance is cited. In तद्धवोदितित्वम् first दधि is introduced; and as a derivative explanation of it तदेन अघिनोद् it is told that it nourished him. So Dahi or curds is called by that name because it nourishes a man (विनुषुष्टौ). On account of that characteristic quality the well known curds is called by the name दधि; for it possesses दधित्वं. So also here अदितित्व belongs to अदिति the mother of gods; because अदितित्व is stated to show the characteristic quality and hence the cause of application of the famous अदिति

that is introduced before. In Shruti अदितित्व is said to belong to Aditi. The termination त्व signifies 'universal' or class name or Jati, like पृथिवीत्व गोत्व and others. If it cannot consistently be a class name it only connotes the essential characteristic of a thing (स्वरूप), like आकाशत्व and चंद्रत्व. Now Aditi being alone Adititva is particularised and hence it cannot be Jati like Akashatva (Akasha being one). So Adititva is the characteristic nature of Aditi This Aditi Swarupa cannot consistently belong to God or Iswara. Because he is categorically different from Aditi. At Adititva is introduced as the predicative quality of Aditi it cannot consistently belong to God, Hari.

The Purvapaksha does not grudge that the Shruti नैवेह किंचनाग्रे आसीत् has Vishnu Prakarana. But it only contends that this reference also should be taken out of its context and should be construed with Aditi Prakarana. As an authority in such extraction and transference to some other context (उत्कर्षण) Chandrikakara quotes from Jaimini Sutras. In the third Adhyaya and 18th Adhikarana there is a Sutra दोष्णपेषणं विकृतौ प्रतीयेताचोदनात् प्रकृतौ. The prakarana is दशपूर्णमास and god Pusha has a share of Pounded (corn) because he is said to have no teeth. But in that Prakarana there is no mention of god Pusha. So this pounding mentioned with reference to Pusha is extracted and construed with the sentence where Pusha is mentioned.

In the same manner अदितेः अदित्वं should be taken out of Vishnu Prakarana and should be read with sentences in Aditi Prakarana. Or another way of disposal also is suggested on the strength of another Meemansa instance, In

दर्शपूर्णमासप्रकरण अभिक्रामहोम is stated. The doubt is whether this अभिक्राम is a part of the whole of Homa or is the part of Prayaja Homa. The Sidhanata is that अभिक्राम is the Part of Prayaja. For this Prayaja is considered the Sub part of Darsha Purnamasa Prakarana. So also even in Vishnu Prakarana the Aditi Prakarana might be considered its Sub part. Then there will be no conflict. Or on the strength of Aditi Shruti even नैवेह the bigger whole also belongs to Aditi and not to Vishnu.

Now begins the Sidhanta. The ground for the settlement of a disputed question is determined. Decisive Linga and Prakarana successfully contradict Shruti and Linga of doubtful significance. Raghavendra clearly explains the stand of Sidhanta. The eating of all (Sentient and insentient) and the Vaishnava context of नैवेहकिंचन necessitates Atta or the eater to be Vishnu only. For these two neutralize the Shruti and Linga in their operation. Besides in a different Shruti Aditi is known to be Vishnu. By limiting the Sense of सर्वा or all सर्वतृत्व cannot be reconciled in Aditi. For in the Sutra सर्व is explained as (चराचर) Sentient and insentient. If Sense is to be limited it is done so after out-right contradiction of the original sense. In the case of Pusha there was contradiction and hence there was utkarshana. As for the remedy of supposition of Subpart, it is possible only when there is संदेश which is found in the statement अभिक्रामंजुहोति while it is not found in the present case.

It is finally settled that even in the view of derivation of Aditi, Shruti herself tells us that the cause of application

of the word Aditi is 'all consumption' which contradicts the conventional sense of Aditi to be the mother of gods. Hence Aditi Shruti, Adititva Linga both refer to Vishnu.

As for Vishnu's abstemiousness (अनश्नन् अन्य) it is explained; away in the coming Sutra that it refers to the denial of consumption of unholy things. As for the Mee-mansaka example of Dadhi or curds, Raghavendra explains the whole story with reference to context of Darsha Purnamasa, Indra's Dadhi is derived thus, with this eulogistic (अर्थवाद) reference. Dadhi is called dadhi because it pleased (अचिनोद्) Indra, deriving the word by explaining its constituent parts.

But formerly Aditi had been used in the sense of Vishnu only there was no need of a search for the reason of this use. If now Aditi means Vishnu then it is a new usage and hence there is no need of repetition of the word Aditi nor the presentation of Adititva as reason. But here though the word Aditi which is not used formerly in Shruti, yet it is used in another Shruti and in secular world Aditi is known to mean Vishnu. Hence there is the need of a search for reason. Then it is quite proper to know that the cause of application of the word Aditi is Adititva which means Sarvatritva 'All consumption' and that suits Vishnu. As for 'just as Abhikrarna is classed as sub topic (अवांतर, so also Aditi is the sub-topic of the maintopic of Vishnu' it is finally stated that on the strength Aditi Shruti 'नैर्वकिचन' also belongs to Aditi topic. Hence it is said in Nyayavivarana that Linga and Prakarana of settled meaning. Supersedes the claims of Shruti and Linga of doubtful meaning. So in the first Sutra there is the mention of

Linga (चराचरग्रहणात्) and in the second there is the context or Prakarana (प्रकरणात्) Linga being more powerful than Prakarana.

Chandrikakara adds a critical note on the interpretation of Mayavadi. The विषयवाक्य is “यस्य ब्रह्मक्षत्रं चोभेम वतओदनः मृत्युर्यस्योपसेचनम्” from काठक. The words ओदन and उपसेचन suggest by implication अत्ता the eater. That eater is Jeeva; For the eater is भोक्ता but Brahma is known to be अभोक्ता. As against this, the Sidhanti contends that no doubt Brahma is अभोक्ता still अत्ता is Brahma himself. For अत्ता means destroyer. संहर्ता.

But Shudha Brahman cannot be destroyer. Only one affected with माया is capable of being a destroyer. But his भोज्यत्व or eating is not in the real sense, it is only in the secondary sense. If the meaning is secondary then let there be संहार्यत्व in the place of ओदन. So ब्रह्मच क्षत्रं च that constitute ओदन need not be secondary in meaning. Then ओदन is संहार्यं only. So if अत्ता is जीव ब्रह्म and क्षत्र will have to be secondary in sense For जीव can never be the destroyer of all Brahmins and Kshatriyas.

Now the inconsistencies are exposed. Let Bhoktrita be found in the conditioned Brahma just as संहर्ता is accepted by you there in. Even अभोक्तृत्व non-eating may be found in Shudha Brahma as the unchangeableness or कौटस्थ्य is found in him. So there need be no giving up of the primary meaning of ब्रह्म and क्षत्र. For their eating conforms to the nature of Brahma.

If the meaning were to be secondary, the **प्रोक्तव** must be internal and not external, as it is introduced by the word **ओदन** and it need not be left out. Besides this in **विषय वाक्य** there is no reference to what has been enunciated (**प्रतिज्ञात**) and the reason (**चराचरग्रणात्**) is not directly stated as it is done in one **विषयवाक्य**. Many many more such excellent merits in our interpretation, inconsistencies and drawbacks in their interpretation are freely brought to light.

GUHADHI KARANAM

BHASHYA :

Paramatma is said to be Sarvatta, all eater. The two are drinking the essence of the fruit of one's action, living in the world (body) won by meritorious deeds. They enter into the cavity of the heart which is under the direct control of vayu. Those who know Brahma call them two (Atma Antaratma) as the ground for the experience of sorrow and joy. These great knowers of Brahman have performed Nachiketa Sacrifice thrice."

The two are known to be drinking; and who are they ?

गृहंप्रविष्ठा वात्मानौ हितदर्शनात्

SUTRA :

These two that have entered the cavity of the heart are the two forms of Vishnu himself. For there is statement in Veda to that effect.

BHASHYA :

Those that have entered the cavity and are drinking the essence of action are the two forms of Vishnu only.

For it is stated in Shruti thus-

“The two luminous, and pervasive entered the body made up of elemental fire, water, and Anna. And the chief Vayu also entered (the cavity) for the service of the two”.

“Hari alone assuming two forms Antaratma entered the cavity of the body; and every day drinks the sweet essence (good fruit) of the actions” (Thus it is stated in Brihat Samhita)

“He drinks the fruit of good action constantly and he does not drink the fruit of bad action. No where or at no time his (motive of) his action is understood. For he is full of perfect bliss.” The word हि shows the popularity of this fact and it is illustrated by such statements as ‘who knew him to be placed in the cavity of the heart.

ओं विशेषणञ्च**SUTRA :**

In the Shruti यः सेवुरीजानाना the one that drinks is qualified by an adjective signifying ‘one’, so the drinking

man is one. Again because that drinking man has been qualified with the attributes of 'सेतुत्व and ब्रह्मत्व' he is Vishnu only and not Jeeva.

BHASHYA :

"He who is the bridge for those who perform sacrifice, who is the greatest and imperishable Brahma.....thus"(1-3-2)

"Because his attributes are innumerable, they cannot be described distinctly (one by one) one word Brahma is used to refer to him, because he comprises all attributes. Therefore the word Brahma is the attribute of Vishnu only. Because his attributes are innumereble, the word Brahma connotes none but that Lord." (In Brahma).

(Others contend that the two that are drinking are Jeeva and God. But this Pada is not devoted to the samanvaya of Jeeva.

In Paingi Shruti it is stated-(The samanvaya of Jeeva is not out of place. For Jeeva and Brahma are identical) But "Atma is real and Jeeva is real; and difference of the two is real. And difference is real. Vishnu is not fit to be worshipped by those who have taken difference to be unreal. This is twice repeated.

"Atma is the greatest and independent; he is full of perfections; While Jeeva is limited

in strength; dependent and low in Status-Bhallaveya Shruti. you make my speech as true as the difference between the Jeeva and Iswara is really true”.

“Just as Iswara and Jeeva are really different one from the other, so also with that truth may gods along with Keshora protect me.”

BHAVADEEPA :

This discussion is related to Shastra; for in this Adhikarana words reported to refer to other things have been shown to have their reference to (समयवय) Vishnu. ‘Panchag nayah’ referred to in the Shruti ऋतुपिबन्ती are 1) the five fires as stated in Taittareeya are Devayajna, Pitriyajna, Bhutayajna, Manushyayajna, and Brahmajajna or 2) as stated in Aitareya they are of five kinds, Agnihotra, Darsha, Purnamasa, Chaturmasya and Pashu soma or 3) as stated in Chandogya they are Dyau, Parjanya Pruthivee, Purusha, and yashit द्यावातपो should be construed as Predicate to पिबन्ती. And they are shadow and substance.

Now to prove that there is scope for doubt it is stated that if the experience of the fruit of action and other things belong to others than Vishnu, then destruction of all also belongs to others. If on the other hand कर्मफल भोक्तृत्व belongs to others as well as Vishnu, then there is overextension of the definition of Vishnu.

For if Jeeva also has full freedom to enjoy the fruit of action as Iswara has got then सर्वानुत्त्व also belongs to

Jeeva, then there is over extension of the definition to Jeeva.

Jeeva is included with Paramatma in the group of those who experience the fruit of action. For it is put in the dual **पिबन्ती**. You need not expect any contradiction of the Shruti that declares the dual number. For duality is justified in Vishnu characterised by unity. Panini prescribes singular and dual numbers to one and two numbers. So **पिबन्ती** must be two in number.

Thus we plead accepting your stand that both have claim to **कर्मफल भोक्तृत्व**. Really speaking Vishnu who claims complete immunity from bondage of Karma cannot claim **कर्मफलभोक्तृत्व**. For how can one who has full control over even Karma, be bound by it ?

How then both Jeeva and Iswara together form the group of **पिबन्ती** ? But that is justified on the ground that though one has immunity both may be called **पिबन्ती** according to the rule **छत्रिणः यांति**. "umbrellabearers go" is said in respect of both umbrella bearers and non-bearers." In the same manner both Jeeva **कर्मफल भोक्ता** and Iswara who is not, may be called **पिबन्ती**.

But when you claim immunity for Iswara in respect of **कर्मफलभोग** you forget his right to **सर्वान्तृत्व** destroyer of all. This objection is not fair. For Iswara can be **सर्वान्ता** 'all destroyer' even without being **कर्मफलभोक्ता**.

Still what is the characteristic essence of both Jeeva and Iswara to distinguish one from the other ? To justify his **Patritva** Jeeva is liable to suffer the consequences of his Karma. The other cannot be insentient For both must be

similar. Nor can we accept them both as Jeeva. For you cannot entertain two Jeevas in one body. Because each Jeeva earns his own body by paying the price of it in the form of his actions. So he alone can enjoy and suffer by residing in that body. So if two jeevas reside in one body, there is none to control them when there is a conflict between the two. This chaos may lead to the destruction of the body. We hear that the bodies of Chaidya and others was an habitat for two Jeevas. But that was under very peculiar circumstances and was for very strong reasons. Besides if it were only one Jeeva there need be no reason for the use of dual. So Jeeva alone is कर्मफलभोक्ता and in the case of Iswara it is formal and not real.

Then begins Sidhanta Raghavendra explains terms used. (आत्मादेहस्यः अंतरात्मा जीवहृदयस्यः) The two forms of Vishnu are Atma and Antaratma. Atma is one that resides in the body; Antaratma resides in the heart of Jeeva.

Vishnu in the form of Antaratma though residing in the heart of Jeeva yet enjoys bliss only through his own senses. He never participates in Jeeva's miseries. This is what is meant by (अनश्नन्) not eating with reference to Hari.

Raghavendra justifies grammatically even a small term used by Jayateertha. In Teeka he has corroborated the statement by quoting Geeta: and in this context he has used गीतासु in plural number. Raghavendra justifies the plural number by stating that अर्थबाहुल्यात् बहुवचनम् there is manifold meaning.

Raghavendra also supplies reason for limiting the sense of अनश्नन् to only 'not participating in the miseries of Jeeva'. In the Sutra असद्व्यपदेशात्-वाक्यशेषात्, a rule has been followed of determining the meaning of a sentence on the strength of the remaining part of a sentence (वाक्यशेषात्). The rule is followed here and in the remaining part of the sentence Hari's Bhoga or experience (of pleasure and pain) is asserted; and hence अनश्नन् or 'not experiencing' of Hari should be interpreted not in controvention of the statement of experiencing. The only way reconciling these apparently contradictory statement is to limit the sense of not experiencing the painful miseries of Jeeva and allowing him to participate in the exhilarating joys of Jeeva which is called Rasa born of Karma.

Raghavendra discusses what is in the remaining part of the sentence and offers a variety of interpretations of अनश्नन्. In Rikshakha it is stated that only श्रेष्ठ has स्वादु a sweet पिप्पलं फलं fruit of action. He who does not know the great Vishnu, is perishable, has no sweet fruit of action. This is the meaning of vakyashesha. Not that Vishnu does not eat; but he does not eat what jeeva eats only. He eats the sweet, not eaten by Jeeva. Therefore the first sentence means (पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्ति) that Jeeva does not eat the sweet fruit; but he eats the not sweet fruit as sweet fruit. This is denied in the case God (अनश्नन्). But he eats the chosen essence of Joy. (प्रविविक्ताहारभुग्यस्मात् शारीरात् आत्मनः). So God enjoys freely the pleasures, and does not experience the miseries of Jeeva. So God is both eater and non-eater. In his case only miseries and

dependent pleasures are denied. In another way also God's भक्षण is described. Jeeva eats to live; while God does not eat to live or he also does not eat gross and physical food. विशेषणात्.

Shruti is Savakasha and hence it is superceded by a Linga of exclusive application (Nirvakasha). So Vishnu is Pata. The Singular पाता is used in stead of dual of रूप. Because it is attributed by a word in singular; so it is Vishnu. But in Bhashya it is said that the drinking agent is only one (पाता) because यः सेतुः; that is singular qualifies पाता as an adjective. And again because Brahma used in its place is qualified by पर, pata is one. So the word Brahma itself exclusively refers to Vishnu and much more so, when qualified by Para.

Raghavendra explains पृथग् used in Bhashya as विविच्य distinguished or distinct. Then begins the discussion regarding the meaning of छायातयो. Advaiti uses this term to support his interpretation that ऋतपिबन्ती are जंवेश्वरी of whom Jeeva alone is a real Pata. His second is चेतन. Advaiti contends that the Adjective छायातयो supports this interpretation. For this phrase means (छाया) Support for Avidya and (आतप) Light. But the real meaning of this phrase 'is one that causes joy and grief to the wise and ignorant.' and not one having wisdom and ignorance.

सत्यभिदा is explained as सत्येनभेदेन which ultimately means सत्येन भेदज्ञानेन which is the reason for not assuming रूपेण or identity.

As both Shruti and Linga are exclusive in application अनशनश्रुति and द्विवचनश्रुति do not affect them. The word ऋतं refers only to सुकृतं result of good action only and not action in general. For very near there is the instance of सुकृतस्थलोके. Moreover Smriti corroborates this meaning ऋतं सत्यंतथा धर्मः सुकृतं चाभिधीयते.

As for the dispute of Adhikarana arrangement, it is fully discussed in chandrika. And critical review of the arrangement of words and the formation of words, is taken up in Tantra deepika and Sutrakara is justified by showing the propriety of each word.

TANTRADEEPIKA :

In this Adhikarana enjoyment of the fruit of action is shown to be the Linga or reason, referring to Vishnu. By juxta-position (योग्यता) ऋतंपिबंतौ is construed with गुहांप्रविष्टौ. For the Shruti runs ऋतंपिबंतौ सुकृतस्थलोके गुहांप्रविष्टौ. And the two that drink ऋतं are आत्मानौ. They are the two forms of Vishnu called आत्मा and अंतरात्मा. And they are not as others say, Jeeva and Iswara; Because they are those who reside in the cavity of the heart. This is an adjective carrying implicitly the reason. Because they are गुहांप्रविष्टौ therefore ऋतंपिबंतौ are no other than forms of Vishnu. गुहांयां निहितं is well known to be Brahma, Because there is Shruti to that effect. (धर्मा समंतात्). Really speaking the Sutra should have the words ऋतंपिबंतौ. But गुहांप्रविष्टौ is inserted in order to show that the latter is the reason for being the former. तत्तु is taken to be construed here

from the Sutra gone long before. This तत् refers to आत्मानो dual. Atma is derived from आदेयमाति and means. 'one who eats a good thing' विशेषणात् tells us that those who drink are the forms of आत्मा and not Jeeva and Isha. Because they are qualified by यः सेतुरीजानाना Singular setu, and Brahma.

TATTVAMANJARI :

Still Vishnu cannot be consistently called 'an all consumer. For in ऋतपिबन्ती, ऋत is the fruit of action; the drinking of ऋत is experiencing the fruit of action. This is attributed to Jeeva and Isware who have resided in the cavity of the heart. But Iswara is specially declared to be abstemious and not eating the fruit. So according to छत्रिणः यान्ति Jeeva is considered as eating the fruit in order to make ऋतपिबन्ती meaningful. When this Vishnu's eating is questioned Sutrakara says गुह्यप्रविष्टी and the next Sutra does so.

This अधिकरण is epitomised succinctly into अत्त, in Anu-Bhashya. This Atta must be read with सर्वगः and लिङ्गः सर्वः यूतो हि. Then the meaning of the Sutra is that, the all pervasive eater is said to be ऋतपिबन्ती, he has resided in the cavity of the heart of all beings and eats the fruit of action. This all consumer is one Vishnu only; and not Jeeva and Iswara. Because he has been favoured by all Lingas. And those marks are residing in the cavity' (गुह्यप्रविष्टी) 'a bridge' (यः सेतुः) 'being an Akshara' and 'Brahma' (अक्षरब्रह्मतत्परं) and 'oneness' or unity shown by Singular number. The eater characterised by these marks

is Vishnu only. For they are well known marks of Vishnu only.

Though we get Vishnu by importing it from previous Sutras, Still is स used to show that it is uniformly so in all Shruties. Or in the Shruti 'क इत्यावेद यत्र सः' he is introduced by the pronoun तत्, that the same Vishnu is introduced here in two forms is shown by सः. The unconcerned Jeeva need not be considered as one of the two residing in the cavity of the heart.

सः is used also to waive the opposition of the Shruti which states that Vishnu does not eat. For that Shruti tells that one who eats what Jeeva does not eat is Vishnu who is ऋतपानकर्ता. Therefore he is said to be अनश्नन्. He is said to be एक in order to reject the view that ऋते पिबन्तो are Jeeva and Ishta. Instead of अत्तारौ, अत्ता is used to show that both forms belong to one Hari.

NYAYAMUKTVALI :

There is the thought link of this Adhikarana with the previous one. Because अस्तुव mentioned in the previous Adhikarana meaning कर्मफल भोक्तृत्व is being thought over again here. Or opposition is raised, being based upon what has been stated previously. In Kathaka it is heard that ऋतं पिबन्तो are कर्मफलभोक्तारौ. The question is whether ऋतं पिबन्तो are Jeeva and Iswara or the two special forms of Iswara. There cannot be identity between the two; because there is the use of dual which is not compatible with unity or oneness. Again one free from the bondage of Karma cannot be the enjoyer of the fruit of

Karma. According to the rule of *सुविणोयाति* only Jeeva and Iswara similar in nature and both being enjoyer fit in the expression *ऋतं पिबन्ती*.

Now on this, Sidhanta view is that *ऋतं पिबन्ती* are those that reside in the cavity of the heart (*गुहाप्रविष्टी*). And this attribute is popularly known to belong to Vishnu only. Besides it is used with attributes like *ब्रह्मत्वं* qualified with *परत्वं*. In other Shrutis it is associated with *सेतु* and *अक्षर*. Hence they cannot but be the two forms (*आत्मा अंतरात्मा*) of Vishnu. Though he is one with reference to his two forms the dual is justified. Hari enjoys the sweet fruit of good actions only. Therefore His *कर्मफल भोक्त्रत्व* is justified. And the *अनशनश्रुति* is equally justified with reference to his refusal to eat bitter fruit of bad actions. So *ऋतं पिबन्ती* are the Special forms of Iswara himself.

PRAKASHA :

The most important part in the former part of discussion is the thought-link with the previous Adhikarana. Formerly the stem *Aditi* was shown a *kriya Linga* namely *अदन* or eating for *Samanvaya*. Here the verbal form is chosen and its termination (*in पिबन्ती*) dual number showing *कर्मफलभोक्त्रत्व* is chosen for *क्रियालिङ्ग* which is found in others things and here shown to refer to Vishnu.

Now a doubt is raised. *Karamaphala bhoktriva* is found even in the profane world to refer to other things than Vishnu. So this does not stand in need of the association of a Shruti of dual number. So why this should be called

'Known as referring to other things on the strength of a Shruti of termination (dual number) ?

Raghavendra pours a shower of reasons for this question. 1) Because in this Pada before and after this, reference to other things is shown only on the strength of other Shruties. So here also it must be so. 2) Or Before this, when Sarvatritva was proved to refer to Vishnu Karmaphala bhoktritva was in its midst and naturally it referred to Vishnu. So other association was found necessary to prove its reference to others. 3) Or still no doubt it might be known popularly to refer to others, yet to show that to add to it there is the association of other Shruti in reference to other things.

No doubt this objection might be cleared by stating that formerly the stem meaning and the termination meaning both refer to Vishnu; yet here they may not do so. So the Purvapaksha was raised differently and this is a counter instance. Still to do so is not wise as will be made clear later on.

Still the objection might be raised in another form. In Bhashya it is stated that the all eater is one and the highest. And in Teeka it is stated that if that is other than Vishnu, then Vishnu is not the all-eater. This objection has already been raised on what has been said before. So this referring to other things on the strength of Shruti of dual number runs counter to Bhashya and Teeka.

No doubt this objection has some stand. 'Reference to others' requires some more explanation; for it does not flash upon the mind easily. So without leaving the former the tatter also is stated for greater enlightenment of the subjectmatter. So it does not amount to an objection.

Raghavendra enters into nicer details. A subbler objection is raised 'Reference to others' (अन्यत्रप्रसिद्धि) is not based on the Shruti of dual number (अन्यत्रश्रुति). For the termination tells us that the eater cannot be only Jeeva. The dual termination shows the eaters to be two who are Jeeva and Iswara.

But the objection is not tenable. 'Reference to others, means reference to something other than the one adopted by the Sidhanta Paksha. Here the one adopted is Vishnu. Hence 'Vishnu with Jeeva' forms something other than the one adopted by the Sidhanta Paksha. Here the one adopted is Vishnu. Hence 'Vishnu with Jeeva' forms something other than Vishnu. Therefore the objection that in both Purvapaksha and Sidhanta Karma Phala Bhoktritva is common does not stand. In Sidhanta this द्विवचनश्रुति does not prove that Karmaphala bhoktritva belongs to Vishnu alone. When it is shown to belong to two, naturally it belongs to Jeeva and Iswara.

Here a question arises why the subject of doubt be made ऋतपिबंतौ and not गुह्यप्रविष्टौ by adopting which you will be directly following the Sutra ? or let the topic of doubt be पिबंतौ only. But it may be objected that it being a clear mark of Brahma there would be no scope for doubting. On this ground you cannot choose पिबंतौ. For Guhapravistatva also is liable to some disability as Jeeva also claims residence in the cavity of the heart.

But on the strength of the dual number the prima facie view of Jeeva and Iswara may consistently be adopted. No doubt this is true, yet in the सर्वत्रप्रसिद्धाधिकरण it is proved

that the one residing in the cavity of the heart is exclusively Vishnu; and (Samanvaya) reference to him, does not manifest any extraordinary qualities of Vishnu. If on the other hand you are successful in proving Pata (one who drinks) to be Vishnu, you know a new quality of sharing the attributes of Karmaphalabhoktriva of Jeeva which is really unexpected and new, in Vishnu. There by you can clearly and directly raise an objection against what has been stated before. Besides the prima facie view gets logical strength because both the stem meaning and the termination meaning find them selves incongruent with Vishnu. Therefore the word Atma is derived (आदेयं नाति) to mean 'drinking' or पातृत्वं

There are so many pairs of alternatives to represent the doubt to usher in the discussion of this Adhikarana as बुद्धिजीवौ OR प्राणजीवौ Why particularly this pair of alternatives viz. बुद्धिप्राणौ is chosen ?

The reason is that as one who drinks ऋत OR कर्मफल one of the alternatives must be Jeeva; and the other alternative must be similar to it, and Iswara is the second to him as his superior companion. Why not then another soul to be a companion with the first soul ? For two souls cannot reside in one body as masters of it without conflict and trouble. In cases of special exceptions like Shishupala and others two souls dwelt in their bodies for extra-ordinary reasons. Besides the context being the greatness of Brahma it is necessary the reference must be to him even as second to Jeeva. As there are no two Gods, two are not referred (in Sidhanta) but two forms of him are referred to.

Raghavendra sets the Purvapaksha in the form of logical argument. If अनश्नत् means the absolute denying of any kind of enjoyment in Brahma, then the meaning of the Stem in विबन्ती is not applicable to Brahma. So on account of this contrary meaning of enjoyment in विबन्ती, ब्रह्म cannot have been used here in the primary sense. So विबन्ती should refer to जीवेश्वरी. This is the net result of Purvapaksha.

Here there are two Purvapakshas—one based on the Stem meaning and another based on the termination meaning. The solution offered by अत्मानौ is based on both the stem meaning and the termination meaning. Now this is the discussion based on 'eating' and hence the first. Now the Second Purvapaksha based on the termination-meaning, taken up. If the dual number does not suit there is conflict and contradiction and Brahma is reduced to its secondary meaning and Jeeva and Iswara consequently stand as agents of eating, But if on the other hand the dual termination suits Brahma as there is no conflict as before ऋतंविबन्ती is used Primarily in sense; and the agents of eating consequently mean the two forms of Brahma, or Vishnu.

But in Purvapaksha as Brahma is immune from the bondage of Karma, he cannot consistently be the enjoyer of the fruit of Karma. And Brahma being one cannot be construed with the termination meaning of two.

If in spite of its unity duality is enforced upon it, then it runs counter to the statement in Jaimini Sutra where Karma bheda is enforced on account of the plurality of

number. In II Adhyaya 2nd pada, seventh Adhikarana a Sutra runs पृथक्त्वं निवेशात् संख्यवाक्यमभेदः स्यात् (21), which refers to a Mantra सप्तदशप्राजापत्यान् पशूनालमत. Now the question is whether one yaga is enjoined consisting of Seventeen offerings or Seventeen yagas each one consisting of one offering. The prima facie view is that Karma is one and each offering is to be referred to the one yaga. Thus by repetition of the offering the plurality of the number is justified. But the final view rejects this interpretation and asserts that the (plurality of) number divides the Karma or yaga. For only division of Karma facilitates each number to refer to the divided Karma. If on the other hand you allow one Brahma to be referred to many times by the plurality of number, here also the plurality of number need not necessitate the division of Karma.

Now this question has already been solved in Ananda mayadhikarana that is true; yet in अन्नमय, प्राणमय and others⁸ he is said to be many in number; but Brahma has not been mentioned there and in स वा एष पुरुषः, ब्रह्मत्वं is mentioned but different names of one Brahma. They only connote different qualities of Brahma and do not serve any thing to bring about division in Brahma.

Moreover many duals (as in पिबन्ती प्रविष्टौ, च्छायातप्रौ) without self contradiction, should not transform their number into singular. For there is contradiction rising against the interpretation of Jeeva and Iswara to be पिबन्ती. A counter instance is produced like ग्रहैर्यजेत where ग्रह is used in plural number; yet it means only singular; for the context is, the house is the subject and the predicate is, should be smeared with cow-dung, ग्रहसंमाष्टि only as

the part of the necessary prerequisite of Homa or sacrifice. For here there is no importance for the number. number is only an attribute of the subject. But in पिवंतौ the drinking is to be predicated of Brahma, which is not already known of it. Hence the number is important. No doubt ऋतंपिवंतौ is the Subject; yet छायास्वपौ is the Predicate. And this duality is exclusive.

Now in the instance of ग्रहैर्यजेत, in order that oneness should be construed with विधेय, if you align it with उद्देश्य ग्रह also being उद्देश्य, with every उद्देश्य the sentence comes to an end. So the sentence will be "A house should be smeared with cowdung; and one must be smeared." Thus there is disunity in the sentence. If on the other hand oneness is aligned with विधेय and संमार्जन also being विधेय, then each संमार्जन belongs to house; and that संमार्जन is one. Thus this again leads to disunity in the sentence. Therefore oneness cannot be attributed to Graha; yet oneness is inherently found in each house. So it can be repeated. But duality is not found in Brahma inherently, Hence it cannot be repeated.

There is one Mantra for offering Havi for Agni in Darsha Purna Masika viz अग्नये जुष्टं निर्वपामि. Then there is another Mantra in Saurya 'yaga सौर्यं चरं निर्वपेत् which is in need of a Pratipadika for syntactical fulfilment (सूर्याय) There is an extended rule that (आग्नेयवत्सूर्यः कर्तव्यः) whatever is followed in Agneya, should be followed in Saurya. In Agneya mantra अग्नये जुष्टं निर्वपामि, Agni in the dative is used. So by the rule of extension in Saurya Mantra सौर्यं चरं निर्वपेत् the word सूर्याय alone is guessed. In the

same monner in the place of पितृन्तौ merely the termination पितृन्त is guessed to exist. But for such a guessing a rule extended (अतिदेश) is necessary which is conspicuously absent in this instance. For it is quoted here only. There is no previous this instance. For it is quoted here only. There is no previous referencce. Hence पितृन्तौ on account of its duality cannot refer to Brahma.

Again in Samanvayadhikarana, the समित् and others were decided to be names of yagas. Then समित् being a conventional (रूढ) word, even one समित् in singular may stand, as in the case of वृक्ष, in the place of समित् in plural. But here the word being used derivatively (योग) cannot change its number.

On this a doubt is raised. In the 9th Adhyaya in the 2nd Pada, in the last Adhikarana, there is stated समिधोयजति and this Samidh is either prescribed for a deity and for the purification of Samidh (संस्कार) yagas are there near by only to help. This is the double horned doubt. But the truth is that in order to bring about सामवायिकत्व it is thought that it is prescribed only for purification. If that is so there ought to have been दative to show that Samidh is meant for a deity as in यदग्नये सायं जुहोति. Then we must suppose that Accusitive is used in the place of dative. But to avoid all this lengthy process we accept the second alternative that yagas are prescribed to help. And the Samidhs there are used as the names of yagas consecrated to deities and those names are repeated by the deities themselves. Repetition or formal use (उपचार) does not amount

to a defect or draw back. For instance the word *इयेन* which conventionally refers to a particular bird, means the name of a yaga on account of its resemblance, by a secondary reference (*गौणोवृत्ति*). And the word *Samidh* which conventionally refers to a group of deities, by secondary reference to some deity on account of the Mantra associated with it or to some yaga. In the references there is no convention at all.

Yet in *Paurnamasyadhikarana* there is a *Phalavakya* where *दर्शणोर्णमासाभ्यां* is used in dual number which is supposed to stand in the place of an indclinable. And on the strength of this it is declared to be name of all yagas mentioned in that context. In the same manner *पिबंतौ* may refer to one *Brahma*.

But as said before there is no occasion for the use of dual number in the context of *Brahma*. Besides *छायात्* does not agree with *Brahma* who cannot be the Support of Nescience as *Jeeva* is. Therefore here *पिबंतौ* are *Jeeva* and *Isvara*; and not *Brahma* alone. This is *Purva Paksha*.

Now *Shidhanta* begins. On the Strength of the exclusive marks of *Lovd Vishnu* we must some how adjust the meanings of *Prakriti* and *Pratyaya* in *पिबंतौ* to suit *Vishnu*. On this principle the reasons adduced in the *Sutra* are marshalled for reviews in one Verse—*गुहावेशात्, ब्रह्मशब्दात्, सेतुत्वात्, अक्षरत्वतः । पारत्वात्, अभयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मवाच निगद्यते ।* These are the reasons why *ऋतपिबंतौ* are the two forms of *Vishnu* only; and not *Jeeva*. One of the reasons, that go against this statement is (*अनश्नन्नन्यः*)

that the other or God is not at all eating. This denial of eating is limited to 'bad things' (अशुभं); while he enjoys 'good things'. While ऋतपानं does not agree with Jeeva. For Jeeva is not धर्मफलभोक्ता; For he eats fruits of अधर्म also while this epithet nicely agrees with God.

Again duality in the reference to Brahma (पिबन्ती) is not a square peg in a round hole. This incongruity due to dual number is tackled in four ways 1) The case stands thus number two signified by the dual number, does not agree with the unity of Brahman. Accordingly the stem-word in पिबन्ती viz पिबत् should be made to mean, by secondary (लक्षणा) method of interpretation, group consisting of eaters and non-eaters by the rule of छत्रिणोयांति. But this is not consistent with the convention of interpretation. For in order to keep in tact the meaning of termination which is subordinate you have damaged by using-Lakshana, the meaning of the stem word (प्रकृति) which is predominant in word formation. On the other hand let us keep the meaning of the stem word पान viz Enjoyer or eater in tact: because it is predominant and to suit that the sense of the termination which is after all subordinate. This is one way of tackling the problem. The instance quoted is यथा एकस्मिन्नेव पश्वे 'अदितिः पाशान्' with reference to one pasha, the plural (पाशान्) is used so also with reference to one Brahma dual may be rightly used.

Again in the 9th Adhyaya and the third Pada there is a Mantra- पत्नींसह. The question is settled that पत्नीं should be used only in the Singular even where two or many are meant. So in all contexts the singular should be

used as all statements should be similar. So there where there is no 'one' yet singular is used. So also here in Brahma though there is no duality yet the dual number is used. Similarly with reference to the beast of Sacrifice in Agni shomeaya only one rope is meant and yet अदितिःपाशान् plural is used, in that very reference. Otherwise in the context of groups of beasts having many ropes you shall have to pull off the Mantra (उत्कर्षः) But that is not desirable. For the termination is subordinate to the stem word. And in order to get manifoldness from the meaning of the termination, You shall have to drag the meaning of the stem word. But this is not a right course. And some how you try to get manifoldness out of unity or oneness. So also here let Brahma be construed with duality joining something to Brahman to make two. Therefore it is not just to pull off the mantra by twisting the meaning of Pratipadika for the sake of number which is an unimportant thing before it.

Therefore here also with reference to Brahman though one dual may be used, for it can be counted, as two, with something else. But a sound objection is raised that the illustrated and the illustration are so widely different that the illustration cannot enlighten the meaning of the illustrated on the strength of similarity. There in the illustration the meaning of termination is molested fearing that the meaning of the Stem-word will be liable to be affected by pulling it off. But here Ishwara is the eater (as stated before) and Jeeva is perceived by every one of us to be the eater. Now if जिवन् refers to both Jeeva and Ishwara, then the meaning of the stem word is taken to be Jeeva

and Iswara and both the meanings are chiefly used. Then one cannot be subordinate to another.

But ऋतं पिबन्ती means the enjoyers of पुण्य or धर्म and jeeva cannot be one who enjoys पुण्य only, for he suffers from अधर्म or पाप also. So in respect of Jeeva the meaning is लाक्षणिक or secondary and hence both the meanings are not similar. Hence the objection does not stand.

Then again in the 3rd Adhyaya and 3rd Pada, in the 14th Adhikarana (युवं हिंस्यः स्वर्पन्ती) two masters are introduced. But in another context एते असृग्निदवः बहुभ्या यजमानेभ्यः according to the number of the termination, the meaning of the word-stem (प्रकृति) is set at naught.

There is some difference between the two Mantras. The Rik युवं हिंस्यः स्वर्पन्ती is a Pratipad Rik which must be quoted at the beginning of every prayer-Mantra. Though this point is made clear in the Sutra, yet here it is made clear so that one need not be under the impression that the meaning of termination necessitates उत्कर्ष of प्रातिपदिक. or stem word.

For two masters two Pratipad should be recited. Now the question is whether these two Pratipads should be recited in Jyotistoma which has only one master assigned to it. Or they are to be pulled off. into such as कुलायाहीन having two or many masters. But it is a rule that one can omit a part of daily routine ritual due to one's inability (of performance). So when one master is not able to perform Jyotistoma, he should take recourse to (वसते वसते

ज्योतिषायजेत') this direction and the verb यजेत has the subordinate sense of oneness of the doer or agent forming a part of the kritu or sacrifice. Still you give it up and attach the प्रतिपत् Ric द्वौ बहवो वा यजेरन् to Jyotistoma it self. So you need not make any 'pull off'.

This is only prima facie view. Really speaking the rule of inability refers to subordinate yet necessary topics and the oneness belonging to the master is not a necessary topic as time and others. Hence it cannot be given up and so it cannot be attached to the stem meaning. It should be pulled off to kulayaheena having two or many masters. You cannot have the sense of 'two masters' from the stem word and hence you shall have to pull it off from else where; and on account of no meaning of the termination there is no pulling off. For the use of the termination is justified for giving us the sense of object (कर्मकारक).

Now the whole argument melts down to this that Brahman along with some one else should form two. But in this context of Brahman no one else is meantioned to join to Brahma so that they can be two. Then let some one from the other context be joined to Brnhman. Even in cases of Veda such extraordinary courses are taken when confronted with difficulties as explained above. Really speaking Shruti does not intend to convey duality; For consistently oneness is imphasised by the previous and coming portions of the text.

But as stated in Teeka "those two residents in the cavity are छायातपो" the duality belongs to the predicate as an adjective. Hence duality is meant by the Shruti.

But mere mention is not the criterion of the existence of dwitva. It must be meant by the author. Here it is not meant because there is a contrary adjective of ascertained meaning, For in (यस्यच ब्रह्मच क्षत्रं च) यस्य with reference to Brahma is used in Singular. Hence duality is not meant.

In द्वासुपर्णं सयुजा सखाया the duality does not refer to number but we know it refers to difference between the two on account of the distinguishing qualities mentioned in तयोरन्यः स्वाद्वत्ति अनन्यन्नयः अभिचाकशीति (between the two birds-soul and god.) As a general rule number shows difference; but as an exception it shows number one or oneness, which is settled by Guha-Prvesh and Brihmatva to belong to Brahman. Then this very oneness is again confirmed later on by यःसेतुः

The cause of exception is that there is confirmation of oneness in the 5th Adhyaya and 3rd Pada. It is said विवृद्धिः कर्मभेदात् There is an enjoinder- एकादशप्रयाजान् यजति षडुपसदः. Number is mentioned and does that number refer to each offering or to the collected number ?

Here different numbers are assigned to प्रयाज (11) and उपसदः (16) And it is possible each one is not accompanied with the number. Hence each one is assigned that number. But it is not possible that either one or five can be eleven. So to establish the syntactical connection with the number, Prayajas in secondary sense mean Prayogas or practical performances. The number is not enjoined so as to be related with the entity of Prayaja; but it is enjoined so as to be related with the Prayoga of it. So the secondary reference is Prayoga related with the number. Therefore

the five Prayogas multiplied by two and including the one amounts to eleven.

Thus it is not possible to contradict the sense of the stem word in order to follow the meaning of the termination. On the other hand on the strength of the sense of the stem word, the sense of the termination should be adjusted, gaining the association of some or declaring its unintentional state (अविवक्षा). There are two solutions possible.

Now a possible doubt is raised. In order to make two there is nothing to add to one. Besides Brahma's essence does not tolerate duality and hence the duality cannot even be repeated. But oneness of Brahma is associated with his duality and hence its use is intentional विवक्षा and unity and duality may be predicated of the same subject. When such a thing is proved to exist no amount of objection can sever their proved association. Many such instances where both are found compatible in one object are instanced.

Oneness and twoness may be found compatible in one thing; but how to explain their compatibility even though they are opposites? Already it is stated that it can be explained on the virtue of vishesha. Another explanation with illustration is given here.

In मेघपतिमेघ and मेघपतिभ्यामेघ मेघ is the beast to be offered to मेघपति (one) or two मेघपति. The word मेघपति means the master of the beast and अग्निषोमी the two deities.

Some say that duality and Singularity in one object is not correct and just. Therefore there is no guess work. But others contend that when both the meanings are

agreeing it is not unjust statement, and guessing must be done.

One meaning of मेघपति is two deities Agnishomeayau. As both of them are deities, from the point of being a deity they are one. For the state of देवता covers both the deities together. But the duality of the deities is explained by the fact that they both occupy seats in two places. Thus oneness and Twoness both coherently adjust themselves in मेघपति. So also here in Brahma by his nature he is one; but looking to his two forms he is two. These two statements though one Mantra differs from each other as they occur in different branches of Veda.

Raghavendra offers a clear analysis of the whole affair. The word मेघपति (मघस्यपशोः पतिःस्वामी) refers to both the master of the Sacrifice and the deity of the sacrifice viz अग्निशोमी. And the one having the dual number refers to the deity; and the one having Singular number refers to the master. The the Sentence मेघपतये पशुं आशासाना means 'the two offered the Pashu to Medha Pati when the sentence refers to the master. When it refers to the two gods the sentence will be मेघपतिभ्यां मेघं आशासाना. This second sentence is just to satisfy the enquiry-किमर्थं आशासाना. For the Pashu is really offered to the gods and not to the Master. His beast is offered to gods. Therefore it is a statement of gods. मेघपतये in singular refers to gods because godhead in this respect is in two gods together. So both form a unity in respect of godhead. Duality is used with reference to the two deities अग्निशोमी separately. Such

a position is accepted in the system of Adwaita, Brahma is essentially one; yet Brahman of the nature of Knowledge is different from Brahman of the nature of bliss. In the same way in the System of Meemansa in मेघपतये both Singular and dual are consistently found together; So also in Brahman.

There are two statements in the illustration of मेघपति one referring to यजमान and the other referring to देवता. But here in the case of Brahman there is only one statement yet there are direct evidences in Shruti and Smriti regarding the multifarious forms of Vishnu. So there Vishnu has two forms and hence the dual number is used.

Brahma is said to be not many; hence he is said to be indivisible. If so we cannot account for his being container and contained. But even though Brahma is indivisible yet he is manifold and so he can be both container and contained.

As this question of manifoldness in Brahman has already been thrashed out why again repetition here is a moot point and is discussed here in all its different shades. In संख्योपसंग्रहात् also manifoldness of Brahma is established on the strength of manifold forms in Brahma. But here in गृह्यप्रविष्टौ Brahma is said to be free from bondage of Karma and yet he is said to be Bhokta and on that point he is said to be Bhokta and on that point he is said to be many. Contradiction of one being many on the virtue of number is the reason of a higher type of the Purvapaksha. While his original reason is the incongruity of one and the same thing being the container and the contained. While in Sidhanta the higher ground आत्मनो is used in dual num-

ber, and Hence his two forms of आत्मा and अंतरात्मा are meant. He is आत्मा (आदेवमाति) and is one who accepts what is acceptable and thus he is the enjoyer of good things only. This is the original ground of Sidhanta. Hence there is no question of repetition.

There is scope again for a doubt. For in II Adhyaya and III Pada in the उत्क्रांति गत्या गतीनाम् Adhikarana, a doubt is entertained whether it is atomic in size or all pervasive. “व्या प्राहि आत्मानः चेतनानिर्गुणाश्च” This Shruti is bound by plural number and hence cannot refer to Iswara; so it must refer to Jeevas. On the strength of this Shruti the Jeeva is thought to be all pervasive. But this doubt and its clearing are both mentioned in नाणुः अतश्च्युतेः इति चेन्नैतराणि कारात्. And a jeeva it is clear cannot both be all pervasive and atomic. Hence there is repetition. But there is difference between both the Statements. In व्याप्राहिआत्मानः चेतनाः there is no mark mentioned of Brahma and because there is manifoldness Jeeva finds scope. Then there is inconsistency of pervasiveness and atomic nature in one and the same thing. Then we find, that there is a previous statement स आत्मा इदं सृजति. in which we find a clear mark of Brahma. The मंत्र, अतेन यात is a Shruti showing the use of dual number. So this dual number is no objection now and when there is repetition justified by context it does not amount to a fault : Then छायात्वं (छायात्तपो) does not run counter to Brahma statement. For it is not a support of Nescience, छायात्तपो is explained as ‘Brahma (Vishnu) gives joy to the good people like Shadow and like the sun (आत्तप) gives painful uneasiness to the bad people. So these special

forms are called छायातयी. An attribute of causing joy and grief though inconsistent in the same Brahman, yet with reference to different persons is not objectionable. No doubt this is not the primary meaning of the two words छायातयी; and even in the Advaiti's interpretation the meaning of Knowledge and nescience is equally not primary. Therefore as there is no unfavourable objection and as there is favourable expression like गृहांप्रविष्टौ, पिबंतौ are the two special forms of Iswara.

Some object to the words used in the Sutra. The word whose reference to Vishnu is to be established (समवेतव्य) is ऋत्पातृत्वं. Then ऋत्पिबंतौ must have been directly used and not through गृहांप्रविष्टौ. But there is some definite gain in taking to this indirect course of reference. Had there been only ऋत्पिबंतौ in the Sutra then there would have been no reason mentioned for this reference or Samavaya. No doubt even by the use of ऋत्पिबंतौ in the Sutra, the two reasons of the Purvapakshee viz ऋत्पातृत्वं and duality would have been mentioned; But the reasons of Sidhanta are more important and they are mentioned in the Sutra (गृहांप्रविष्टौ)

So long every Sutra after तत्समन्वयात् has the benefit of the repetition of तत् which is being bodily construed with the words of the Sutra, as in आनंदमयः तद्ब्रह्म (in आनंदमयो-भ्यासात्) and in the coming Sutras also as in अंतरः तद्ब्रह्म. Accordingly here also the construction would have been गृहांप्रविष्टौ तद्ब्रह्म. Yet आत्मानौ as the predicative noun is used, to explain the use of dual number in Shruti, by reminding that आत्मा and अंतरात्मा are the two forms

referred to by the use of the dual. By implication अनशन Shruti also is explained by the use of आत्मा; For by derivation आत्मा means आदेवं उपादेयं सुखंमाति enjoys only that which is good.

Now about the order of the words in the Sutra. It follows the order in the topical sentences which are ऋतपिबन्ती first and then यः सेतुरीजानाना. No doubt the Second ought to be first because it is the श्रुति which supplies the reason; yet it is a part of the second Statement and not of the Vishayavakya. Hence the present order is followed.

Some of the interpretations of others are critically reviewed. Some interpret the two to be Jeeva and Iswara. On the strength of the two adjectives used viz छायातपो, in preference to Jeeva and Budhi But छायातपो become aptly significant when applied to Jeeva and Budhi in the sense of sentient. Though छायातप really mean 'darkness and light' yet they can be some how brought to mean insentient and sentient. Again what is lost when जीव and बुद्धि are preferred and what is gained when we choose जीव and Iswara? Even in this interpretation the stem word in पिबन्ती (पातृत्व drinking) and the meaning of termination द्वित्व duality find place in Jeeva and Budhi. If the first alternative is accepted (Jeeva and Iswara) we do not find 'drinking', even super-imposed, in Iswara. Hence the meaning of the stem word is not to be found. Because Jeeva and Iswara are accepted to be identical even termination meaning of duality is not to be found in this alternative.

In the same manner in the alternative of Budhi and Jeeva 'Residing in the cavity' is applicable. While in the

case of Jeeva and Iswara, Iswara being all pervasive cannot reside in small place, hence 'residing in the cavity' is not applicable to Iswara. Mere similarity counts little in such respects, Besides similarity is not warranted by Shruti. Really speaking even similarity can be established between Budhi and Jeeva from the point of view of dependence. In the same manner in this Purvapaksha of Budhi and Jeeva one insentient and another sentient, they may be called **आयत्तौ**. In the alternative of Jeeva and Iswara both being identical there is no similarity in the primary sense. Thus there is Triple benefit.

Now the other interpreter in his Sidhanta of Jeeva and Iswara an alternative admits all these three and besides he will be able to establish Samanvaya of **ऋतपिबंतौ** in Iswara. So he pleads propriety in his alternative.

But in both the alternatives of Budhi and Brahma the meaning of drinking is secondary and not primary. So what real difference is there between the two alternatives? Why? In one Budhi and Jeeva are mentioned; and in another Jeeva and Iswara are mentioned; this is the difference.

But the condition of the interpreter is precarious because in his system as in my system 'the resident in the cavity' does not contribute a reason. The real reason is similarity pointed by the meaning of the stem-word **पिबत्**. Therefore in Sutra **पिबंतौ** must have been used for the sake of brevity, easy understanding and to show that Nomenative case cannot be discarded.

But the all pervasive Brahma cannot reside in a small cavity. This constitutes a reason why Budhi and Jeeva

should be accepted in preference to Brahma. To this the interpreter says that at the end of विशेषणात् Jeeva is said to be the master of chariot or the goer (आत्मानं रयिनविद्धि) and paramatman(तद्विष्णोः परमपद) is the place to be reached. Therefore they alone are ऋषिपितृ.

This contention is not fair. For there it is stated that Budhi is the charioteer (बुद्धि सारथिविद्धि) and that is its attribute (विशेषणात्) The two (बुद्धितु and जीव) are the पिबन्तौ. And not जीव and ईश्वर as he contends. Though पिबन्तौ refers to Brahman secondarily and not primarily yet it has also reference to Jeeva. Might be ! But you have restricted the reference to Brahman only in the Adhyaya in ईक्षत्यधिकरण by denying such reference to anything else. Hence this your interpretation becomes disconnected with the previous portion of the Adhyaya. So the Paksha of Jeeva and Iswara is not fair.

Another interpretation is taken up for review. They form the Adhikarana with four Sutras beginning from अत्ताचराच'गृह्णत् Raghavendra gives the argument of the Adhikarana. "एस्य ब्रह्म वक्षत्रचोभे भवत आदनः मृत्युः यस्योपसेनतम्" In this quotation we have ओदन and उपसेचन mentioned which suggest one अत्ता or eater. Now whether this अत्ता is Jeeva or Paramatma is the doubt. Now this Atta is one who is ready to enjoy the fruit of his own action. Only Jeeva is liable to have the fruit of his actions and hence Atta is Jeeva only. But Atta is not an ordinary consumer. He is the consumer of all implied by the mention of Brahma and Kshatra. He is thus all troyer. This is applicable only to Brhma. Besides formerly it is stated

that without his grace, he is ununderstandable. The same is here referred to कइस्यावेद (who Knows him) So this is Brahma Prakarana and hence Atta is Brahma.

But a strong objection is raised against this conclusion. Later in ऋतपिबन्तो we hear of one who enjoys the fruit of his actions. Therefore these two must be either Budhi and Jeeva or Prana and Jeeva. Brahma being free from the bondage of karma cannot be taken here. Again Linga is more powerful than Prakarana and ऋतपान is the Linga and it sets at naught the weak Prakarana (viz Mahantam) of Brahma. Because it is far away. As for the present Statement "यस्यब्रह्मच" is not set at naught; because it is near. Therefore गुहाप्रविष्टौ are Jeeva and Iswara. This is the Sidhanta.

But this Shidhanta of others has already been refuted by stating that this interpretation is not in conformity with the textual sentence selected for interpretation (विषयवाक्य). Now that the argument of Adhikarana sought by others is not consistent and coherent is to be shown. So first how they argue out grouping of the four Sutras into one Adhikarana is presented for critical review.

Shruti Prakashikakara contends that Sutras 1) अत्ताचरा चरग्रहणात् 2) प्रकरणात् 3) गुहाप्रविष्टौ 4) विशेषणात् form one Adhikarana. Because they are not interrupted by any other Adhikarana or Pada. And they are syntactically connected, one being dependent on the other, and treating the Subjects of a sentence belonging to the same context. No doubt they separate textual sentences for interpretation. That does not constitute a reason for separate Adhikarana. To make the point more clear, the first two Sutras अत्ता and प्रकरणात् have 'यस्यब्रह्मेति' as their Vishaya Vakya. And Sutras (गुहा and विशेषणात्) have 'ऋतपिबन्तो' as their Vishaya vakya. But these two sentences belong to the same context and they are interdependent; and syntactically related.

Their interdependence (उपजीव्योपजीवकभाव) as depicted by Śruti Prakāśhikakara runs thus; If according to Purvapakṣha the sentence ऋतपिबन्ती refers to Budhi and Jeeva then ऋतं does not refer to Brahma at all. Then as suggested by महान्तंविभुमात्मानं it cannot belong to the context of Brahma. Then the sentence यस्य and others, immediately preceding the sentence ऋतं severs its connection of context with महान्तं which has come in between and connects itself with ऋतं in context, refers to one who enjoys the fruit of his own action as पातृ and hence refers to Jeeva. If on the other hand according to Sidhanta ऋतं refers to जीव and Brahma then it refers to Brahma. So the context belongs to Brahma the sentence यस्य also propounds पातृ to be संहर्ता and this is the अक्षर of Brahma. Hence ऋतपिबन्ती refers to Brahma. Thus what is stated in the first two Sūtras, is dependent on what is stated in the latter two Sūtras.

This argument is not fair. According to our interpretation the first two Sūtras are based on the Brahādarāyaka statement, while the latter two treat the sentence as from kākāka, so the topic chosen does not come from one context.

As for the interdependence by उपजीव्य उपजीवकभाव which forms the ground for one Adhikāra, that too is not sound. What was said to be ब्रह्मप्रकरण on the strength of महान्तंविभु, and on its strength was said to be ब्रह्मप्रकरण of यस्य, was proved to be false by ऋतपिबन्ती; But this is not reasonable. For यस्य is not between these two statements, Had it been so the ऋतपिबन्ती, which has Brahma as referent would have contradicted the reference to Brahma of those that are referring to Brahma. But ऋतं occurs just after यस्य. So how can ऋतं contradict the reference to Brahma of यस्य.

It was so long argued that in the Sutra अन्नाचराचरण हणात्, both Brahma and Kshatriya suggest the inclusion of all movable and immovable; and these are said to be the accompaniments of main food of death. All this clearly shows that अन्तः is figurative and clearly means 'destroyer of all' Hence Atta is said to be only Vishnu. Now in the argument what Mrityu accepts as उपसेचन need not be under the control of Mrityu. Hence Brahma Kshatra and others are not proved to be eatables. Making most of this fact upasechana is taken in some secondary or subordinate sense. Then forfeiting the import that the upasachana is not under the control of Mrityu, it is accepted in a specialised sense 'Besides being eatable it causes eating by others'. Thus it becomes 'fit to be eaten'. Then Sutra is interpreted so as to mean 'giving up of the common quality'.

Even this interpretation of Ramanujeeayas is not acceptable. For there is repetition. In प्रोदातृणां the number of the sacrificial priests sixteen which is the common number of such priests is abandoned. And special number according to the view of Bhasyakara is four only viz उग्दातृ, प्रस्तोतृ प्रतिहर्तृ and सुब्रह्मण्य.

While according to the opinion of Vartikakara only three, leaving out Subramhanya, are accepted as प्रोदातृ. In the same manner In मासाग्निहोत्रं जुहोति, Leaving out the common meaning of Sacrifice for अग्निहोत्र, a special meaning of having Suryadeva for the daily sarifice is accepted. This has been already stated in the 7th Adhikarana. So there is no necessity of repeating it here.

This takes into account all others that follow Ramana and declare them to be automatically condemned.

It is stated in Teeka that if this कृतपानकर्तृत्वं belongs to others only (than Vishnu) then Vishnu cannot be सर्वात्ता or all deslseyer'. If that belongs to others as well (as to Vishnu) then Lakshana or definition is over extended to

others. Chandrikakara is going to refute objections raised on this. Raghavendra supplies the objections. 1) Teekakara has shown असंभव of the Lakshana. (Absence of Lakshana in Lakshya or thing defined). But there is no असंभव because it is already accepted that 'All destroyerhood' is the definition and only a part of that belongs to others; hence this is not an instance of असंभव. you cannot say that a part of it cannot be made of it and so the whole of Sarvattritva cannot belong to it. For even in your Sidhanta in Vishnu there is no evil eating (अशुभ). So there cannot be असंभव. 2) This very alternative (that सर्वतृत्व belongs to others only) is impossible. For in Purvapaksha it is accepted that कृतपातृत्व belongs both to Jeeva and Iswara. Besides, the second alternative (that it belongs to others as well) also is not there because the Purvapakara has not agreed that पानकृतृत्व belongs to Iswara. You need not use अपि (अन्यस्यापि) or 'as well' with propriety. 3) Though a part goes to others exclusively yet the whole of (अतृत्व) is not over extended.

Chandrikakara meets all these objections. The refutation begins thus: The definition consists of सर्वात्ता which is actually existing. Though evil eating is not compatible in Brahma yet कृतपातृत्व which is nothing more than शुभपातृत्व or eating of good things is in him. असंभव is possible only when we accept Jeeva and Iswara and Iswara as eaters of whom Jeeva is primarily the eater and Iswara secondarily. If on the other hand both Jeeva and Iswara are accepted primarily as eaters, then Jeeva also eats good things and hence he has a claim to be सर्वात्ता and so there is the over extension of the definition. So here the view that both are eaters primarily must be considered as the views of Purvapaksha.

Significance **of** **the Picture on the** **Jacket**

Raghavendra offers a harmonious interpretation of the Brahma Sutras which is Symbolically represented by a Veena being played on by his deft fingers. But he does not claim any Originality in the composition of the Spiritual music. It is at the inspiration of Badarayana-Vedavyasa and his favourite disciple Shri Madhva, both of whom are represented as being in different worlds and yet interested in his interperntional music. His five glosses that are Summnrised here, are Bhavadeepa, Nyamuktavali, Tantradeepika, Tattva manjari, and Prakasha, which are Spmbolically represented by his glowing heart, pearly necklace, a burning lamp a garland of Tulsi leaves, and the Spiritual light litting his face. Thus the picture is real and yet Symbolic and highly Significant with esoteric meaning.

Books by the same Author

- 1) Shri Raghavendra his Life & Works
in English Vols 1-7 Rs.
- 2) ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಕನ್ನಡ ಶಬ್ದಕೋಶ ಸಂಪುಟ ೧
" " " " ೨ Rs.
- 3) ಕನಕನ ಕಾಣಿಕೆ (೩ನೇ ಅವೃತ್ತಿ) (ಅಚ್ಚಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ)
- 4) Nyayasudha (Jijnasadhikarana)
in English Rs.
- 5) ವಿಶ್ವಧರ್ಮಗಳು Rs.
- 6) ಗೀತೋಪನ್ಯಾಸಗಳು (ಅಚ್ಚಿನಲ್ಲಿ)

Copies available with
G. B Joshi Extension GADAG

Rs. 7